

Christian Faith and Life

Combining *The Bible Champion* and *The Essentialist*

Volume 37

DECEMBER, 1931

Number 12

EDITORIAL

Christ is Born

Christ is born! Messiah, God our King!
O Christ is born! Let Heaven's archangels sing!
He God of God, a man for men became
From sin to save our race.

Christ is born! The Eternal all forsakes,
And joins Himself to Adam's ruined race.
Through veil of flesh His glories gleam; but we
Beholding, scarce adore.

Christ is born! He came with men to share
The cost of sin; its dreadful guilt to bear;
He came to die, that dying He might live,
And lead man's way to life.

Christ is born; Behold the tides of grace;
From death to life He lifts the ruined race,
From hell to heaven; man's place at last the Throne—
So high the Savior lifts.

Christ is born! Is born that men might see
That love of God for God—the Trinity—
Which moved creation's toil, redemption's Cross
And crowns at last the whole.
Christ is born!

A Request to Co-operate

WE are quite sure if our friends knew just what is the cost for postage and stationery, and how much labor is involved, to send out bills at the end of each month to those whose subscriptions expire, they would at once send in their Renewals so that we might apply the amount to the partial covering of the usual deficit!

Perhaps few of our subscribers can appreciate what this expense means to us. True, the mailing of a single bill requires only a two cent stamp. But 2,000 such bills cost us \$40.00 in postage alone. But, after all, the cost of postage is much less than the cost of labor involved. And we are required to send out bills every month in the year!

May we urge all our friends to cooperate with us and *send in their Renewals in good time* since it means so much to us.

Your Address Label always shows the month and year subscriptions expire: e. g. "Dec. 31" means your subscription expired with Dec., 1931, issue.

Thank You!

The Meaning of Christmas

AS springtime is quite familiar but always lovely, so is Christmas. We are familiar with every detail of the story; but each year over again we love to remember and adore.

FULLNESS OF TIME

It was the fullness of time.
The world spoke one language.
Roman peace reached from Britain to the Euphrates.
Ancient religions had decayed and skepticism was dominant.
The hearts of men were eager, expectant.
There was a feeling that something would happen because the need was so great, and common expectation looked eastward for the great event.

HEROD OF JUDAH

The house of Herod the last of Judah's kings, was upon the throne. The first Herod, and the greatest of them, had been made king in 37 B. C. when he conquered Jerusalem. Eighteen years later he began the building of the *Temple*. It was a magnificent work, the main structure rising 150 feet into the air, and built of glistening white marble, ornamented with gold. The Temple itself had already been completed some years when Jesus was born, though the work as a whole was not fully finished thirty-three years later when He died. Daily at the hour of prayer in this majestic sanctuary Israel was accustomed to breathe her hope of Messiah's advent, and to bless God for His promise. The words of this prayer were:

"Proclaim by thy loud trumpet our deliverance and raise up a banner to gather our dispersed and gather us together from the four ends of the earth. Blessed be Thou, O Lord, who gatherest the outcasts of Thy people."—(10th of the 19 Benedictions in the Temple worship.)

BETHLEHEM

Six miles south of Jerusalem, Bethlehem sat small and white upon its mountain slopes; a village rather than a city. It was built of the native white sandstone with square flat roofed houses and narrow streets. The houses were crowded together, making the streets like alley-ways, close and dark. The city lay east and west, the same as the hill it crowns. The khan which was more like a modern tourist camp than a hotel, was at the eastern end, overlooking the valley.

Below in the open country the Temple sheep were grazing. December in Syria is usually a mild month, and the shepherds often spent its nights out of doors instead of in the sheep folds.

TRAVELERS

That December, in the year 6 B.C., many travelers came to Bethlehem. The Pro-Consul of Syria, a general by the name of Cyrenius, had recently published the order of the Emperor, requiring all persons to return to their ancestral cities and there enroll themselves that the total resources of the Empire might be known. In obedience to this order many had come to Bethlehem, and the khan was crowded to overflowing.

Among those who had come late were a young man and woman from Galilee. The young woman was soon to become a mother. They could not get into the khan and so turned for shelter to one of the grottoes near it, a cave in the side of the hill, that had been used for a stable. Cut in the native rock of this stable pavement was a stone manger, where the cattle were wont to be fed. In this manger Mary would lay Messiah at His birth.

STAR

In the Syrian sky shone a brilliant star. It was a conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn, Mars and a fourth evanescent star in the sign of Pisces. The people talked about it when they met in the market places, when they sat at home and when they lingered by their campfires. They wondered what the star might mean. In far away Persia, wise men of the East, accustomed to study the heavens, had seen it also and wondered. Later they would mount their camels and journey westward over the desert to Jerusalem.

HIS BIRTH

And so the sun went down in the western sea. The stars came out. Messiah's star shone bright. The Temple shepherds watched their flocks by night; and then in the midst of the starlit silence appeared a glory, and a voice: Hark! "Fear not," he said, "for behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord. And this shall be a sign unto you: Ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes lying in a manger."

The shepherds were filled with awe at the shining presence and the wondrous words. They did not speak. They did not move. They only gazed. And then suddenly as they looked the single messenger became a choir and the night echoed with divinest music.

"Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace to men of grace," they sang. How natural it all was! How superbly fitting! For should not angels sing when the *Awful God* in love comes near to men?

But the song dies away, glory faded, and the shepherds were again alone by their camp-fire. Unmoving they sat in silence. They could not break the spell of their heavenly visitation. After a time one of them rose, as if waking from a sleep. The message of the angels was not wholly new to these men. They knew the ancient prophecies of Messiah. They had felt the expectation that was all about them. Often, too, at the Temple they had listened to the words of that tenth benediction: "Proclaim by Thy loud trumpet our deliverance, and raise up a banner to gather our dispersed. *Blessed be Thou, O Lord.*"

"Let us go and see," he says, "let us go even unto Bethlehem and see this divine word that has become a fact."

They leave the flocks with one of their number and make their way across the narrow valley to where the hill of Bethlehem rises steeply on the west. They press their way to the summit; find the new born child still in its swaddling bands, lying on His straw in the narrow stone manger, just as the angels had said. They bow down and worship Him.

ANALYTICALLY

Such is the beautiful simplicity of the story of Christmas. Messiah's star was natural but divinely related. When God hung the worlds he timed their conjunction to light Messiah's birth. He had no human father, but this mystery of Mary's virgin motherhood was not known. Bethlehem supposed that Joseph was the father of the Holy Child. It was not until after His resurrection that the mystery of His birth was told. Through three decades Mary had kept it as a precious secret, treasuring it in her heart.

Messiah's birth room was a grotto, not a palace or even a home. He was born as only the very poorest are born. There were no attendants. God works His sublimities without display; and yet for one brief mo-

ment the joy of heaven did overleap all its bounds, and there was an angel song.

WHO IS HE?

Who is He, Who thus so humbly and yet so augustly came to earth? Answer: He is God the Son, One Who knew the everlasting ages before there were worlds.

St. John describes him in his matchless prologue. We paraphrase those mighty words:

Standing at the beginning and thinking backward into the abyss of the infinite, we find the Son, the expression of the Father, communed with God. And the Son was Himself God. All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made. In Him eternal life was; and that life which was forever in Him was through all the years of history the light of men.

At last in the fullness of time, this one, the Word, the Eternal Son took upon Him human nature, and appeared as a man. And the glory of God shone through the veil of His humanity and he beheld it, a wonder of grace and truth.

St. Paul also has given us a description equalling in majesty this by St. John. He says: Messiah is "the image of the invisible God, the first born before all creation: For by Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by Him, and for Him: And He is before all things, and by Him all things consist."

Who is He? He is One Who shares that plurality of deity expressed in the story of creation, in the divine name, Elohim, Gods. "In the beginning Gods fiated the heaven and the earth—And Gods said let us make man in our own image." He is God the Creator and sustainer of the worlds become flesh. He is God with God, very God of very God who for us, men, and for our salvation, was made man.

THE CERTAINTY OF HIM

Do we stumble at so great sublimity, doubting it just because it is so wondrously satisfying to our hearts? How blind! We were made to believe in the Incarnation. Why do children so easily accept Santa Claus and fairies? Is it not because our hearts were built for such a faith? Why do all religions quite inevitably think of God as being personal, as man-like? Is it not because this

truth is a universal and unescapable human intuition divinely formed within our minds?

The answer skepticism offers to this question is absurd to the point of childishness. They say men think of God as personal because this is our highest category; and that if dogs had gods they would similarly think of them as dog-like, because dogs would be their highest category. We reply, if dogs had gods, dogs would not be dogs. Unbelief has no facts. This is not reasoning, much less science. It is a riot of imagination. The facts are that men do have gods and that universally they show a tendency to think of them as man-like; and the reason is evident. We think of God as personal because personality is the only conception of Deity which makes Him sufficient to be the creator of this beautiful, ordered, moral, finite universe. Whether we can think a higher category than personality is not the point. Rather it is this: *Infinite Personality* alone is adequate to be the explanation of a finite universe which reveals at once a transcendent creative will behind it, and a will motivated by intelligence, a sense of the beautiful, and a sense of the moral. We think of God as personal spirit-mind, not because this is our highest category, but because such a Being is necessary to explain this particular universe.

Probably also the idea of a personal God behind the universe is intuitive within us. It may be an immediate reaction of man's spirit mind.

The mystic fairy world of childhood is not a mere illusion. It reveals a lost sublimity, a vanished splendor. Man is indeed a fallen being; the infinite he sees he does not fully see. He feels, he apprehends, but does not comprehend; and out of these blurred images the religions of the nations were made.

How dull we have been! Religion is inescapable; it is therefore true. God lives; He is near us; we are ever in His presence. How stimulating it is to hear faith affirmed week after week by first one scientist and then another!

Sir James Jeans, in his new volume, *The Mysterious Universe*, affirms that the stars are only words; that their reality is a divine idea.

Sir Arthur Eddington, one of the most distinguished astronomers of England, asserts that religion's interpretation of reality is more accurate than that of the natural sciences.

Professor Michael Pupin, physicist at Columbia, calls electrons the fundamental quantities made by the Creator out of which also He made His worlds.

Professor Arthur Compton, physicist at Chicago University, professes his belief in spirit, freedom and immortality.

Dr. W. R. Whitney, head of General Electric's research laboratories, describes all natural forces as manifestations of the will of God.

Recent tendencies in physical speculation are making evolution meaningless. Evolution can stand for nothing in the new science beyond the order of God's creative activity. All reality rises constantly in the divine mind. The boastful, assertive materialism of yesterday is as dead as ancient mythologies. God stands today an observed fact of experience, recognized by science, as well as an immediate certainty of our souls.

We feel that He is near us. We cannot feel otherwise. We pray to Him. We expect of Him.

Through all the centuries there has been a dim promise of His coming. And then at the strategic moment of history, just when He was most needed He came. The Creator took flesh. God the Eternal Son became a man. His birth place is marked. It is a grotto at the eastern end of Bethlehem's hill. Justin Martyr knew it. Jerome lived near it, and amid its sacred associations translated the Bible into Latin. The spot of Messiah's Nativity is marked with a silver star and the words are written, "Here was born of the Virgin Mary, Jesus Christ."

He was born, He lived, and He is not dead; for history knows not His grave. We know the grave of Confucius. It is in Kung Cemetery, just outside the city of Kiu-h-fow. It is a grave and is marked as a grave. We know also the mound where the dead body of Buddha was burned. But the grave of Christ is uncertain, and that which is said to be His, is open and empty; and upon its marble couch no human body ever lay to disintegrate.

He lives! All history affirms Him alive. The traveler who walks through Paris is impressed that he is in the city of Napoleon, for he finds the marks of Napoleon's vast activity everywhere. Similarly the student who reads modern history will come everywhere upon marks of the creative influence of Jesus Messiah. Without Him and His

open, empty sepulchre all modern history would be an enigma. We would be able neither to explain life's failure before He came, nor its progress since. Why does he divide the ages? Deny His transcendence, as God incarnate, virgin born and risen from the dead, and there is no answer. Affirm these things, and instantly all stands clear. Jesus Christ is the central fact of the ages. Before He came the ages await Him. Since He came the ages rise out of Him. The centuries fitly become, as it were, a mighty choir lifting increasing allelujahs to His name. Higher and ever higher rises their sublime refrain.

Womanhood that was in dishonor, the love slave of men, is lifted to a place of reverence, man's equal.

Childhood that was tyrannized, and often

brutally neglected and slain, is sacredly cherished.

All life takes on a new sanctity because Jesus dies and rose again for all, and brings to all alike the promise of immortality.

Slavery disappears. Governments become free. Industry moves on toward brotherhood. Unemployment is seriously faced as a problem which must be solved. War is challenged.

The refrain of the Christian centuries is rising to an ever higher pitch. Higher and yet higher it lifts—"And He shall reign forever and ever." It is the song of our faith, our worship, our lives, our institutions. At last it will be made full: "The kingdoms of this world will have become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ."

This is the promise of Christmas.—H.P.S.

Comments on Topics of the Times

PROFESSOR LEANDER S. KEYSER, M.A., D.D.

Valuable Testimony

An extremely valuable article on "Present-day Views in Old Testament Study" appeared in the July number of the *Union Seminary Review*, published at Richmond, Va. It was written by James L. Kelso, D.D., Professor of Semitics and Biblical Archaeology in the Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pa. In speaking of the vast amount of new material relative to the Old Testament that has recently been discovered, he has this to say: "Some see here the confirmation of their liberal views; others insist it vindicates the staunchest conservative position; and some of course say that we have at last a *via media*. My personal thought is that, when this material is duly weighed and evaluated, Old Testament scholarship will speak a far more unanimous voice than in many a year, and that this voice will be a conservative one."

More Good Testimony

The major conservative group of Old Testament scholars, says Dr. Kelso, "feels that the Pentateuch is substantially the work of Moses, or at least of the Mosaic period." Then he adds:

One thing already conclusively demonstrated is that the Pentateuch contains a vast sum of technical, historical, sociological and religious details which reflect *only* that historic period to which each is assigned in the Scripture narrative, and which, therefore, could only have been preserved by an accurate written record, or by oral tradition

accurately passed down until such a date that it was first put to writing. In other words, the writer or writers of our Pentateuch were using materials virtually contemporaneous with the events they narrated. Even such material as the Abraham narratives, portray so accurately the secular history, the social customs, and the religious conditions of the period of Abraham that they must be admittedly sourced in that period only.

A Further Quotation

Dr. Kelso touches the tender and vital point in his concluding paragraph. We are happy to let our readers share it with us:

The final question of course is this: Does all this increasing research speak for or against the supernatural nature of the Old Testament? Personally we feel that this evidence is demonstrating more and more that the Old Testament is the very Word of God, and that it is worthy of that high honor which Jesus Christ gave it. It was the Bible which He studied, and it is the Bible which we should study. We must not forget that the Scriptures are both the Old Testament and the New Testament.

Safe Breaking Not Safe

In his famous department, "Talking It Over," in the *Christian Endeavor World*, our friend, Dr. Amos R. Wells, gives the following information:

The way of the transgressor is made harder and harder by the ingenuity of law-abiding men. For instance, a safe has now been invented which, as soon as any beginning is made at tampering with it, lets loose a flood of tear-gas, and the robbers, choking and blinded, are an easy prey of the police. So it is, in the end, with all sins. They provide their own protection. They are traps for malefactors. They are full of tear-gas.

Yes, how true this is today, as it has ever been! Solomon said the same thing long ago: "Though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not be unpunished" (Prov.11:21.)

"Thou Art Inexcusable, O Man"

The whole Pauline verse reads as follows: "Therefore, thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things." This rebuke applies to the editor of the *Michigan Advocate*, who always takes the side of the Modernists. Here is an excerpt from one of his editorials:

The *Advocates* are the great panacea for the little mosquito publications that wing their way over the face of Methodism, stinging good men and good causes, mistaking bitterness for religion and acidity for righteousness. An editor does not need to be a honey-bee, but he certainly does not need to be a hornet.

Do you think that very nice and kindly talk? Will not the sentence from St. Paul, quoted above, apply to this editor? In a later issue of his paper he has this to say about being kind and gracious:

In everything we say and do let us be brotherly; yes, even in what we think. Prayer will do more than criticism. It is a day for everybody to keep sweet, for the Methodist ministry robbed of brotherliness would be intolerable.

Let the reader compare the two quoted paragraphs, and then let him wistfully sigh, with the renowned William Shakespeare: "Oh, consistency, thou art a jewel!"

Let Us Reason Together

A correspondent of the *Sunday School Times* writes as follows to the editor of that journal:

Our pastor (a Modernist) said recently that, after Jesus had listened to the fanatic teaching of John the Baptist, He went alone into the desert, and there decided to give His life to His people, the Jews.

Here we have a sample of much of the reasoning of the Modernists of our day. The trouble with them is, their logic is upset. Where is there any evidence that it was the preaching of John the Baptist that caused Jesus to decide on His life work? Years before He met John, our Lord said, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" When John the Baptist saw Jesus, he recognized Him, and said of Him, "Behold the Lamb of God which beareth away the sins of the world." John also said of Jesus, "He that cometh after me is preferred before

me; for He was before me." John also said: "And I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God." At the same time the voice of the Father came from heaven, saying: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." All these passages prove *prima facie* that Jesus knew long before the incidents at the Jordan River that He was the Son of God and had come to redeem the world from sin. Where did this Modernist get his idea? Not from the Word of God, but from his own subjective theories.

The Divine Image and Evolution

What kind of a creature was the "dawn man" of evolution? Some scientists think that it was the Java man; others that it was the Piltdown man (Osborn). Now look at the pictures of these two men as they appear in the books published by the evolutionists. Note their savage and beastly aspect. Would anybody think of holding that either of these crude, coarse and bestial-looking beings was the first man of Genesis, who was created in the image of God? Just think it over. When did the evolved man appear who could be identified with Adam, the first man of Genesis? And further: according to the Biblical account, God immediately spoke to the first man and woman and said to them: "Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion," etc. (Gen.1:28.) Could the dawn man of evolution have understood such a command? Indeed, could and would God have spoken at all to the Java man, or the Piltdown man, or any other man just evolving out of brutedom? And, besides all this, what kind of a God would He be who would determine from all eternity to evolve man from brutes and cause him to make progress through the gory struggle for existence? Just compare this view with the Biblical conception, and see that the difference is *toto coelo*.

Biblical References to Nature

Some one recently said that "the nature references in the Bible are merely incidental and non-authoritative." But think of the many, many references to nature in the Bible. The very first chapter deals mostly with the natural cosmos. Much of the second and third chapters treat of nature. How many of the Psalms refer to nature! In the latter part of the book of Job, God Himself appeals to the natural creation to prove His omnipotence and omniscience. Read some of

Christ's parables and His many allusions to the realm of nature. Peruse Rom.1:20; 8:19-23; Col.1:16,17; Heb.11:3; John 1:3; Psalm 19:1-3. Can it be that all these numerous references to nature are "incidental and non-authoritative?" If the Bible errs when it speaks of natural things (which the God of the Bible created), how can we believe it when it speaks of spiritual matters? The same Christ who was the incarnate Son of God, who made expiation for sin on the cross, who rose from the dead, who ascended to the right hand of God, and who liveth forever—that same Christ accepted and endorsed the Old Testament Scriptures, and said, "They are they which testify of me," and that He came to fulfill, not to destroy them. And He made no exception of their many references to the realm of nature.

The Making of Woman

If the first woman was not fashioned in the way depicted in the Bible, how did she come into existence? How was the differentiation of sex in the human family effected? Is there any thinkable way for it to have been achieved through the process of evolution? If so, let it be described. On the other hand, take the Biblical account. Suppose that God, in taking a "side part" (Hebrew, *tsela*) from Adam, the original generic and genetic man, probed deep into his seminal or procreative being, and took from him the femininity, and from it builded (*bana*) the woman, that supernatural operation would have achieved two great and important marvels: it would have preserved the solidarity of the human family, and at the same time would have accomplished the differentiation of sex, thus making possible the procreation of the human race. While we are not insisting dogmatically on our explanation, yet we do hold that it is a thinkable way of achieving the grand result, while no other way can even be imagined. The Bible way is in accord with biological principles.

Yes, We Mean It—Biological

And why biological? Because, when Adam awoke from his sleep, and saw the woman standing before him, he said something very profound: "This is now bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called woman (*ishshah*), because she was taken out of man (*ish*)."¹ The Hebrew *ishshah* is the feminine of *ish*, just as in the Latin *vira* is

the feminine of *vir*, and in the German *Männinn* is the feminine of *Mann*. At once Adam realized that she was of the same stock (genus) as himself, and yet that she was female while he was now male. The biological fact of sex differentiation had been accomplished. The woman was different, and yet was of the same genus as himself. So he recognized her at once as "a help meet for him." But none of the animals around him could fill that place, because, first, they were animals and not human beings, hence not mentally and spiritually companionable; second, because biologically—yes, and cytologically—they were unlike him, and therefore could not serve him for procreative purposes. Let us not be over-hasty about throwing aside the Biblical account of the origin of the human family. It may prove, after all, to be scientific.

The Unity of the Human Race

The above explanation accounts rationally for the unity of the human family. One human being was originally created and fashioned (Gen.1:27; 2:7), and from his psychological and physiological being all other human beings have come. In Dr. C. F. Kiel's great critical commentary on the Pentateuch, which is worth owning and studying carefully, we find an apt quotation from Dr. Franz Delitzsch (p.89):

That the race of men are not species of one genus, but varieties of one species, is confirmed by the agreement in the physiological and pathological phenomena of them all, by the similarity in their anatomical structure, in the fundamental powers and traits of the mind, in the limits to the duration of life, in the normal temperature of the body, in the average rate of pulsation, in the duration of pregnancy, and in the unrestricted fruitfulness of marriage between the various races.

All of which confirms the Biblical narrative.

Some of Paul's Theology

We have been much impressed with a recent re-reading of Paul's address to the Jews at Antioch in Pisidia (Acts 13:16-41). First, he recites the history of Israel in their bondage in Egypt, their wanderings in the wilderness of Arabia, their entrance into the promised land, the rulership of the judges, and the establishment of the kingdom of Israel under David. All this is recited as *history*. The Mosaic age is treated as just as historical as are the subsequent ages. But Paul went back still further into Biblical history than the time of Moses. He address-

ed the Jews as "children of the stock of Abraham." So Paul regarded Moses and Abraham as historical characters. But in the same sermon Paul proclaimed the resurrection of Christ, saying, "But God raised Him from the dead, and He was seen many days of them," etc. (verses 30,31). Again: "But He, whom God raised from the dead, saw no corruption" (verse 37). We certainly like Paul's theology. He preached that forgiveness and justification came through faith in the resurrected Christ (verses 38,39).

Paul Believed in Adam

But elsewhere in the New Testament we see that Paul went back still further in the history of the human race as it is recited in the Old Testament. He went back to the primogenitor of the human family. With Paul Adam was no myth. Let us note what he says: "Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression" (Rom.5:14; see also verses 15-19); "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead; for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive" (1 Cor.15:21,22); "The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit" (1 Cor.15:45ff.); "For Adam was first formed, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived; but the woman, being deceived, was in the transgression" (1 Tim.2:13,14). In these passages we see that Paul believed, not only in the reality of Adam and Eve, but also in the historicity of the temptation as recited in Gen. III. Will the mythians please take note?

The Trinity and Tritheism

Sometimes people express the doctrine of the Trinity in this formula: "God the Father, and God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost." Their meaning is all right, because they intend thereby to assert their belief in the actual deity of each person of the Godhead. Yet we believe that there is an element of danger in the use of the above-recited formula. The repetition of the word "God" three times gives the impression that there are three Gods—that is, it seems to connote the error of Tritheism. It is better to state the doctrine as Christ gave it in the baptismal formula: "God, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost." The use of the word "God" only once implies that there is only one God

—Monotheism; while the use of the three names, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, clearly indicates that there are three persons in the one Godhead. That is the true Trinitarian doctrine. It cannot be misunderstood when it is expressed in that way.

Re-thinking Our Religion

An expression on the lips and the pen-points of the Modernists is that we must "re-think" our religion. There is this much truth implied in the statement: we cannot merely accept the religion of Christ because our fathers did and because it has come down to us by tradition. Each person must do some thinking of his own, and each person must experience for himself the saving truths of the gospel of Christ. This is taught explicitly in the Bible, for example: "Except any one (Greek, *tis*) be born again (or from above), he cannot see the kingdom of God." However, as the term, "re-think," is used by the liberalists, it means that we must so modify our religion as to make it agree with their rationalistic views. If the gospel presented in the New Testament is true, why must we "re-think" it with our puny and limited intellects? Why is it not better to accept it as it is so clearly and graciously set forth in Holy Writ, and thus experience its truth through the inner witness of the Holy Spirit. The trouble today with much of people's "re-thinking" is that it is wrong. It makes fallible human reason the final court of appeal in matters of religion.

Adam and Eve in the Garden

Is it all an allegory, this wonderful story of Adam and Eve in the garden? If so, what does the allegory represent? Is it God's way of trying to teach us that we have sprung from a brute ancestry through the gory struggle for existence? Does Adam, created in the divine image, represent the semi-simian Java man? Does Eve stand for some female just emerging from brutedom? Does the garden of Eden represent an African jungle, infested with wild and ferocious animals, stinging insects and venomous reptiles? And what is meant by the tree of life in the midst of the garden? In the so-called "allegory" what does "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil" represent? Just try to interpret this strange "allegory." If it is an allegory, it is certainly a very obscure one, and no man can decipher its meaning.

A Continuing Vision of Christ

In that useful book, elsewhere reviewed, *5,000 Best Modern Illustrations*, by Dr. G. B. F. Hallock, we find an apt illustration which we give in somewhat abbreviated form. After years of hope and effort, Mohammedan pilgrims at last reach Mecca and gaze upon its sacred scenes. In order that they may not afterward profane that vision, they kneel on white-hot bricks which destroy their sight. Afterward they say: "The last thing we saw on earth was the holy city. Since then we have not seen." How much better is the gospel of Christ! Says the Moslem, "See Mecca, and then be blind." Says the Christian: "See Christ, and thenceforth find larger and still larger vision." "To the one the vision is the end of things; to the other it is the beginning."

Induction and Deduction

In reading over again parts of W. C. D. Dampier-Whetham's *A History of Science*, we came across a paragraph which we shall capture:

In 1920 it was pointed out by N. R. Campbell that, to a man of science, even the logistic syllogism seems to depend on induction. Take, for instance, the familiar case: all men are mortal; Socrates is a man; therefore Socrates is mortal. By observation and experiment we find that certain bodily and mental properties are uniformly associated; this law is expressed in the concept "man." That concept is also found to be associated with the property of mortality, and we state another law that the association is universal. It is a fair inference that the law will hold for the individual, and Socrates prove to be mortal. But the argument as thus put involves induction. Of course the pure logician will say that the premises are supposed to be given, and logic is only concerned with deductions from them. Campbell holds that, if reasoning be really without any inductive element, it carries no conviction to a scientific mind.

Both Elements in All True Reasoning

We believe that in all true and convincing rational processes both induction and deduction must be used. Take, for example, the inductive reasoning for the existence of God. There are the general, cosmological, teleological, and moral arguments. They depend, first of all, upon an examination of the cos-

mos, including the human race, and then the proper inference (induction) is drawn that they point to a Supreme Intelligence back of and in the investigated phenomena. That is what we call the inductive process, the Baconian method, and it is valid and convincing to most minds. Now we can turn about and use the deductive method. Assuming that there is such a Divine Being as the inductive method has given us, we can reason deductively that the existence of such a Divine Being is the only adequate explanation of the phenomena of this diversified cosmos. Furthermore, we can successfully challenge the advocates of any other philosophy to suggest any other adequate explanation.

"Darwin, the Destroyer"

Some years ago (September, 1926), *Harper's Magazine* contained an article by this title, "Darwin, the Destroyer," by Mr. Gamaliel Bradford. Among the things which he declared that the Darwinian theory of evolution had destroyed was belief in man's immortality. The doctrine of the struggle for existence going on for age upon age, with millions of creatures and human beings perishing, makes it almost impossible to believe that the individual man is of enough importance for his existence to be perpetuated. We can easily believe that this is the effect that will be produced in the minds of the exponents of evolution. But does it satisfy the hearts of men? Note the dismal feeling expressed by Mr. Bradford himself as the result of his loss of faith in Christianity and the doctrine of a future life. He says that he and his fellow-skeptics have the feeling "of being aimlessly adrift in the vast universe of consciousness, among an infinity of other atoms, all struggling desperately to assert their own existence at the expense of others." How different is the Christian doctrine and hope! Christianity teaches that what struggle for existence there is, is the result of sin, which it is the business of the gospel of Jesus Christ to eliminate in God's own time.

Springfield, Ohio

Our doubts are traitors and make us lose
the good we oft might win, by fearing to
attempt.—*Shakespeare*.

Our grand business undoubtedly is, not
to see what lies dimly at a distance, but to do
what lies clearly at hand.—*Carlisle*.

Christian Evidence

BISHOP H. M. DUBOSE, D.D., LL.D.

The Apocalypse and Greek Thought

A LARGE evidential value resides in the fact that the Scriptures, both of the Old and the New Testament canons, not only agree with contemporaneous history; but that they relate themselves in corroborative or corrective wise to the world thought of the ages in which their respective parts were written. Genesis, for instance, not only parallels the lines of Babylonian cosmology and ancient world lore; but is a corrective of the misadventures of Babylonian thought and history writing, where the Hebrew and the Babylonian traditions come into contact.

A species of loose critical thinking has assumed that the Pentateuch, particularly, is given an enhanced interest because of the resemblances of sections of its cosmologic, legal and historical materials to given sections of the Mesopotamian writings. But the fact is that, without the corrective bearing of the early Hebrew Scriptures on these writings, they would have little value, and would be as incoherent as the Delphic oracles.

The most unique book of the New Testament, the Apocalypse of St. John, overlaps and enswathes classic Greek thought in the age in which it had begun to amalgamate with the materialistic and militaristic thought of imperial Rome. The true history and thought of the Graeco-Roman age is more thoroughly reflected in the Apocalypse than in the works of Tacitus, Seneca, Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius or Josephus. Also, this reflection is through a prism whose analyses and separations discover the true chemistry of contemporary life and activity. "The Greek power, and afterward the Roman, supplied the apocalyptic seer with the material for the formation of his conceptions" (*W. Boussett*). Eschatology was the form in which Judaism accepted the gage of battle from these two powers, "ruling the world by external might and inner mental superiority."

Apocalyptic literature thus sprang up

among the Jews during the Greek era of their national history. How far a certain apocalyptic atmosphere which widely existed during the Seleucidian-Maccabean age was the common ground of this quality of Greek thought and the apocalyptic writings of pre-Christian Jews must remain a matter of speculation. However, coincidence is demonstrable, and the conclusion is more than a guess that the relationship is real. Both the Greek and the Jewish cultic literature, from the century immediately following that of Daniel, moved in a realm, from which inspiration in the canonical sense was absent.

To Jewish letters of this date belong the book of Enoch, the psuedo psalms of Solomon, the apocryphal Esdras and the Pseudepigrapha in general. The Book of Enoch, the distinctive apocalyptic of the period, is quoted twice in the New Testament; while other pseudepigrapha colored the translation of the Seventy, an achievement of the same general age. But with the approaching close of the century of the apostles, an apocalyptic writing, the Revelation of St. John the Divine, came under the utterance and authorization of the Holy Spirit. This writing, while exhibiting fullest tokens of inspiration, yet follows certain lines of development common to the Jewish apocalyptic and to the thoughts of the *koine* Greek age at its best.

It is hardly enough to say that the resemblances of these two bodies of literature, Greek and Jewish, are only of general human intellection and reasoning; for it always appears that the Greek parallels are undeveloped and unattained ideals in those lines of unfolding in which the Christian apocalypse is a complete and abiding realization. Oriental Hellenism not only furnished to the New Testament writers the language in which their compositions were expressed; but it also indicated many starting points which were carried by inspiration to enlarged and particular ends. This we have seen is the way in which St. Paul

availed himself of the philosophy and literature of his time, correcting their errors but applying their sanities.

It is not our plan to seek out those points in the Revelation that seem to pick up detailed references to Greek theology or cultic symbols, as the dragon, the serpent or python, embodied lust (Venus, the scarlet woman), hades, the grave, Tartarus, the pit, or a score, or more, of supposed Greek creations reconstructively traversed by St. John; but it is rather our purpose to follow several major eschatological tendencies in Greek teaching and thinking that find a final and perfect treatment in the Apocalypse.

1. The Greek mind came finally to a concept of eternal future existence. It is worthy of note that the conclusion concerning last things was only fully conceived and stated when Greek life and nationality were near the age of yielding to the slowly growing power of Rome; just as the Christian Apocalypse marked the end of the Jewish state and temple cult. The epics of *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained* were written in the half developed pagan concepts of classic Greek tragedies and heroics, as also most perfectly by the Revelator of Patmos, long before the Puritan master undertook his task.

Bodily resurrection was both unknown and disallowed, as being unthinkable, in classic Greek belief; but the notion of a life after death was distinct and insistent. The gardens of the Hesperides, the isles of the blest, and the oft discussed fellowships of heroes in the bourne beyond the Styx constituted a series of tenets on the hereafter that need no polemic of defense. With sage and with hind, it was enough to know that the spirit should live and walk in Elysian fields under the smiles of happy gods. That the body should be retrieved from inanition and the grave was written in the light of a star which rose never on Athens nor Alexandria. The Greek knew of no empty sepulchre.

In the nature of the case, the resurrection was missed in Greek speculation and reasoning. Even with the Old Testament writers, it was but a half imagined mystery. It was left for the Christian revelation to bring it to light through the Gospel. In connection with St. Paul's sermon on Mars Hill, it is shown us how far were even the wisest of the Greeks from an understanding of this doctrine. Plato's concept of immortality widely missed St. Paul's teaching concern-

ing "immortality, eternal life," if for no other reason because it was void of the glory of the risen body.

Of all the New Testament writings, the Apocalypse gives us the most enlarged and detailed view of the life beyond. The Master left a matchless picture of the house of eternal dwelling; but he bequeathed to the beloved disciple the task of defining the place and order of the life ordained to the citizenship of the heavenlies. Plato, in recalling the dialectics of Socrates, when he pictured what must be the state and employment of the disembodied souls of men, to be gathered "beyond the rim of the cosmic sphere," produced upon the minds of his listeners only a dawn shadow as compared with that perfect light of day which glows through the last chapters of St. John's Revelation.

2. An earthly golden age, or period of human completeness, is prophesied in every attitude of the higher thought and art of the classic Greeks. A long past golden age, under the rule of Saturn, was, indeed, by both the people of Latium and those of Greece believed to have been; but this was only a time of agricultural thrift and domestic simplicity.

A return of this age in multiples of intellectual and national greatness was expected and awaited. This, however, was to be a Greek millennium, the rule of the superman, before which the *ethne* were to fall in a servitude supplemental to the making of the perfect Greek. Every well reasoned philosophy of the academy; every tragedy and lyric, laurel winning in the Olympic contests; every statue after the type of the Jupiter of Phidias, the Apollo Belvidere and the Venus de Milo; as every color after the school of Apelles of Cos, presupposed a coming race of which these replicas were prototypes.

Such race was to tread the soil of Attica and its encircling isles. This race, made universal, and divinely delivered into both spiritual and intellectual completeness, is visualized in the Apocalypse:

And I saw a new heaven and a new earth. . . . Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them . . . and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain . . . and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years.

3. A judgment of final rewards for the world to come was a doctrine more fully developed amongst the Greeks than amongst any people of antiquity except the Jews;

but the decrees of this judgment were partial and with barely a show of ethical standard. Paradise, the place of rewards and the accounted dwelling of the spirits of the just, and Tartarus, the realm assigned to those who displeased the gods, were most unequally assessed to human merit and offending. This, of course, was the echo of a lack of moral sense in the living, the confusion of the Greek notion of sin and its just punishment. The furies and the erinyes that guarded the portals of the underworld and visited vengeance might be thwarted or outwitted. The hell and the heaven of the Greeks were rather outlying providences of the present commonwealth of sense than distinct and immutable states of mind and soul.

Nevertheless, Greek eschatology distinctly affected the Jewish apocalyptic during the

four centuries when the voice of revelation was mute in the oracles of Israel. Moreover, Greek theological terms not only entered into the translation of the Old Testament of the Seventy; but also appeared in the terminology of the New Testament itself. But especially in the Apocalypse, these terms are quickened and regenerated into a resurgent life. Witness the words of this record: "And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire . . . And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." As to the paradise of the just, as shown us in Revelation, "there shall in no wise enter into it any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination or maketh a lie." Thus stand the thoughts of the Greek and the Christian Revelator.

Nashville Tennessee

Current Scientific Discoveries

PROFESSOR GEORGE McCREADY PRICE, M.A.

The Blight of Pantheism

IN view of the very wide prevalence of pantheistic habits of thought in modern times, it may be profitable to offer some reflections on this subject.

Strictly speaking, pantheism is not a religion, but a philosophy. Certain aspects of it, such as the materialistic monism of Haeckel, often affect a scientific pose, and claim to be an interpretation of the total view of natural science; but this is not science, it is philosophy. Pantheism is that scheme of things which tries to reduce God and the universe to a unity, saying that the totality of existence, the universe in its entirety, is all the God there is. It identifies God with the universe. It is protean in its forms; but all alike deny that God is a being or person Who transcends the universe, a being Who has created all that we call the material universe and Who now controls and directs its every phenomenon, from the protons and electrons, the cells and the organisms, to the galaxies and super-galaxies circling through infinite space.

The name "pantheism" seems to have been coined by a certain John Toland a little over two hundred years ago. But the scheme of thinking thus designated is quite as old as the oldest recorded attempts at cosmic thinking, being the basic idea of the sacred writings of the Hindus, which date from near the dawn of history. Among the ancient Egyptians and the Greeks also pantheistic notions were very widely held, and from these they were passed along to the Romans, among whom pantheism in various aspects was very widely held in the early days of the Christian church. The apostles had to meet it in the form of Stoicism and other forms of Greek philosophy, and they always regarded it as the very quintessence of paganism. A little later the Neo-Platonists tried to revamp Christianity into conformity with their theories of the world; but the Church again shook off these hybridized forms of religion, and not until the Middle Ages did this old pagan philosophy reappear in the occidental world.

Erigena taught it in the ninth century, thus introducing it into the Catholic schools and furnishing various subjects for the intellectual acrobatics of the Schoolmen. Bruno, who was burned as a heretic in 1600, framed a system of personified nature; and from his time onward these ideas seem never to have wholly disappeared. Baruch Spinoza (1632-1677), a Jewish recluse living in Holland, has probably been most influential in spreading pantheistic ideas among subsequent writers, his influence being clearly seen in the writings of such literary leaders as Goethe, Wordsworth, the two Arnolds, Emerson, Carlyle, and many others. Not all of these could be called consistent or thoroughgoing pantheists; with some of them, their early Christian training and the ambient influence of the intellectual climate in which they lived usually got the better of those anti-Christian sentiments borrowed from pantheism which seem always to have been regarded as the polite or fashionable aspects of paganism. But there is no denying that through their literary charm many so-called "classic" writers have infected the whole of modern literature with pantheistic speculations; and these writers, strongly assisted within the past half-century by the prevailing theories of natural science, have been the chief source for the great popular spread of these ideas throughout our modern world.

As intimated above, pantheism assumes many diverse forms. At one extreme is the materialistic phase, which seeks to explain the universe in terms of the atoms and molecules, the electrons and protons, saying that God is simply a pious name for the universal energy pervading the universe. At the other extreme is the mentalistic or "idealistic" phase, which practically denies the reality of matter and seeks to explain the universe and all human experience in terms of mind or spirit, making all phenomena only illusory and transient phases of an assumed universal "Mind." Between these extremes there is room for a thousand forms, especially when we remember that multitudes hold pantheistic views in various departments of their thinking, without taking the trouble to shape up the rest of their mental processes into consistency with their pantheism. But all forms of pantheism alike deny that God is a real personality, a Being with an abiding place, Who wills, thinks, and loves, transcending the material universe. Hence they always dispense with the Atone-

ment and all possibility of a divine revelation. If God is All, and All is God, there can be no real distinction between good and evil; there is no explanation of sin, no use of protesting against it, and no possible hope of a time in the future when sin and death will be abolished. The pantheist may think virtue better than vice, but all such distinctions are based on his personal estimate of values; there is no such feeling as "How can I do this great wickedness and sin against God?"

The presence of moral evil or sin in our world is as obvious as is the existence of electricity or light. But because this taint of evil, inherited or acquired, has infected our minds as well as our bodies, there are many enticing avenues of thought which we can never hope to explore to the farther end. Sooner or later the mind loses its way, circling about in labyrinths of its own creating. And if one by some extra mental exertion thinks that he has at last blazed a trail through the Unknown to the "Absolute," the only result will be that he will succeed in making this fruitless, this asymptotic search for "truth" a self-perpetuating delusion, tempting all succeeding generations to repeat the same weary quest for wisdom without any divine guidance. "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God; but those which are revealed belong unto us and to our children." (Deut. 29:29.)

All attempts to reason about the universe or about the totality of things, always move only in the thin air of high abstractions. An ever present danger in this rarefied intellectual atmosphere is the very common error of what A. N. Whitehead calls the "fallacy of misplaced concreteness," or the blunder of mistaking the abstract for the concrete. We are all prone to love with inordinate affection the children of our own brains; these brain-children seem very real to us; they become objectified; and with repeated use they tend to become objects of our intellectual worship. We bow before these graven images of the mind, and we induce many others to follow our example, all forgetful of the wise command against such a form of mental idolatry. Bacon's four *idola* were not by any means the only ones whose worship interfered with clear thinking at the time of the rise of the natural sciences; nor has their number diminished with the triumphant progress of science in our modern age.

A clever German writer has compared the employment of professional philosophers to

the efforts of a baby sucking at a nursing bottle. So long as there is milk in the bottle, the baby sucks with pleasure and profit; but presently the bottle becomes empty, or it gets into a wrong position; but the baby keeps on sucking just the same, with resulting discomfort and colic. Well would it be if grown-up children would recognize the limits of the intellectual milk supply, and not like the infant, keep on sucking empty air. Some problems must ever remain unsolved by us in our present mortal state; those that are most essential to our well-being have been mercifully revealed to us by our Father. Yet every generation seems to furnish a fresh supply of the people mentioned by Barnum, who are intent on following the intellectual acrobats of Neo-Platonism and mediaeval scholasticism in their tight-rope dance across the chasm which separates us and the knowable from the region of the Great Unknown.

It is easy for our modern pagans to sneer at what they term anthropomorphism, remarking that instead of God making man in His own image, man has made God in his image. True Christians have never been frightened by this bugaboo. The Bible is very clear and explicit in teaching that the living God, the Creator of the universe, is a person, a being Who wills, loves, and plans for the good of His people. The Bible very positively teaches God's omnipresence or "immanence" (in the proper sense of the latter word); but it also teaches just as positively and clearly that there is a place in the universe where God abides, or where He is to be found in a sense in which He is not to be found in other places. If these statements appear to be mutually contradictory, the reason is because we do not understand all the facts. Those who are familiar with the teachings of the Bible will have no difficulty with this paradox. God is present everywhere throughout the universe *by His word and by His Spirit*, His word being just as effective throughout even the most distant parts of His universe as near at hand, for the simple reason that matter has no "properties" save those that God has given it, hence it can have no innate inertia or reluctance to act which God's word would have to overcome to induce it to obey, even when this word reaches out across the boundless fields of space. This is doubtless a crude attempt to describe the actual facts, but possibly it may help some one to understand what is in reality a very simple condition, if we once grasp

the idea of a living God, the Creator of the heavens and the earth.

Furthermore, Jesus Christ, the preexistent Son of God, is always spoken of in the Bible as having been associated with the Father in all the work of Creation. And He came to earth to show us what God the Father is like, veiling His deity with humanity, that we mortals might thus become acquainted with our Creator without being consumed. Our finite minds can never hope to comprehend the Infinite One; but in Christ we are to behold the Father, and learn as much about the Eternal as we need to know. Beyond this we must trust the hand that never wearies, the mind that never blunders, and the heart that never grows cold.

The space available will not permit me to do more than refer to some of the scientific facts which have been appealed to in support of the pantheistic philosophy.

Chief among these are what are familiarly termed the correlation of forces and the conservation of energy. These great and far-reaching scientific principles have shown us that law and order reign everywhere, and that all the varied manifestations of energy can be equated with one another, being thus merely the manifestations of one eternal and all pervading energy. Those manifestations which we familiarly know as gravity, heat, light, electricity, etc., are not really separate "forces;" for they are all easily transmutable back and forth without loss, and hence must be only different forms of some one energy. This is not a theory but a fact. Doubtless all the vital processes of organisms could also be correlated with the others, if we could devise sufficiently accurate instruments of precision.

Accordingly, we see that law and order reign throughout the universe; and we are compelled to choose between two opposite views:

1. Either the universe is self-sufficient and runs itself, we ourselves being but insignificant atoms or cells of the great All, a view which would give us a pantheistic or monistic materialism; or—

2. The great Author of the universe must be far more closely connected with the phenomena of nature than the older philosophies ever imagined, in fact, must directly carry on all natural phenomena, aside from those few processes or instances which can be shown to be due to the agency of beings endowed with the power of free choice.

To us in modern times there seems no possible middle position. We must believe in a materialistic or an "idealistic" (or "mentalistic") pantheism, or in a Christian theism in which the great Creator is the One "in Whom we live and move and have our being" in such a real sense as makes this thought a very uncomfortable one to sinners who have not yet learned to love the great Father of us all. I cannot see how there can be any third choice for any one who knows anything of physics and chemistry, and who persists in thinking things through to a conclusion.

The almost universal spread of the theory of evolution is also a gauge of the prevalence of pantheistic theories; for all pantheists are evolutionists without exception, and few can hold to the evolution theory in any form and still believe that the world has been made by a personal Deity.

Advocates of Modernism often taunt orthodox Christians with believing in an "absentee God." On the contrary, the Bible very explicitly teaches the direct control of all natural phenomena by the One Who created the universe. But the natural human heart

has never welcomed this thought of God's direct control of all the forces of nature. It always makes sinners uncomfortable to feel themselves thus under the constant gaze of the Infinite. Few have been willing to work and live as ever in the great Taskmaster's eye. So they invent a philosophic scheme of some sort that tends to push the Creator away off out of direct consciousness, or they draw the veil of a scientific pantheism over their minds and hearts to escape from the constant reminder of their personal responsibility. In ancient times they seem to have done the same, as the earliest records of mankind in Chaldea, Egypt, and India plainly declare. Thus the intimate knowledge of nature which mankind evidently had in the morning of our world, degenerated into the pantheism and nature-worship which we find so early in all secular history.

Today the world is repeating the story of this first universal apostasy. A few here and there are seeing the better way; but the many have chosen their own way and will not be turned aside. "When the Son of Man cometh, shall He find faith on the earth?"

Berrien Springs, Michigan

The Church in Europe

FREDERICK HASSKARL, M.A.,B.D.

The Y.M.C.A. in Convention

THE Y. M. C. A. of Wilmington, Delaware, has one of the very finest physical equipments in the world. The Christian citizens of "the first city of the first state" are justly proud of its rare possession. However, back of what the Wilmington Y. M. C. A. has in "things seen" is to be found its secret: the spiritual forces. Its leadership is positively and actively Christian.

So it happens that I am indebted to two of the leaders of our local Y. M. C. A. for a mass of material regarding the Association's relationship to the Church in Europe. They are A. E. Lindley, General Secretary, and Chas. H. Groesbeck, Director of Programs.

I am combining in this article 1. "First

World Conference of Young Men." 2. "Third World Assembly of Boys and Boys' Workers." 3. "Twentieth World Conference of Y. M. C. A." Time: July 28 - August 7, 1931. Places: Toronto, Canada, and Cleveland, Ohio.

It is claimed that these were the most spiritually inspiring conventions held in many years. It is interesting to learn, that as a whole, the Americans emphasized the ethical aspect of Christian motivation, whereas the Europeans stressed the spiritual concepts. The Americans beginning with man reached upward to God; the Europeans having their starting point in God, strove downward to man. The first were as Martha busying herself about many things; the latter were as

Mary sitting at Jesus' feet. Never before was there such unanimity in keeping before one's mind the cardinal purpose of the Y. M. C. A.

All reports, personal and printed, are one in the profound impression the European delegations made. These men had come out of the morass and throes of nations, in which crass materialism, defiant atheism and threatening anti-church movements had for years since the World War been lifting their sinister banners with increasing audacity. They knew from bitter experience what the Christ of the Ages meant and should mean in these of negative revolution. It, therefore, was the more impressive as they bore witness to the all present and ever living Saviour of mankind. Their earnest presentations were indeed food for serious thought.

Just a word about the excellent "Hand-book." The representatives of forty-eight nations found a common mode of communication and worship in the three world languages: English, French, and German. One is grateful for the orthodoxy of the hymns. The old "stand-bys" are there: Isaac Watts' *Jesus shall reign where'er the sun doth his successive journeys run*. Pierre Corneilles' *O Dieu de Verite, pour qui seul je soupire*, and Martin Luther's *Ein feste burg*. And as is the general rule: As the music goes, so goes the worship. So it was.

With these remarks, I come to the addresses, especially to those belonging to "The Church in Europe." Yet, I must linger a moment over the burning address of Dr. Toyo-hiko Kagawa of Japan. It belongs into the category of the great confessions of Christendom. I wonder how the Modernists would treat it? I feel sure they would assure us that Dr. Kagawa knows very little about modern psychology and the so-called "higher" criticism! Nevertheless the stubborn fact remains: the living Christ of the New Testament is the source of his entire life, for in Him he lives and moves and has his being. I shall quote but a few of his pregnant thoughts:

At that time, I was miraculously led to the Bible Class of an American Missionary where I went to learn English. But the more I studied the English Bible, the more real and beautiful the life of Jesus Christ became to me. Before that time, I had learned something about the theory of evolution and I concluded that there was no God. But when that beautiful passage (Matt.6:24-34) of Jesus Christ came to my ears, ringing like a Christmas bell, new life came into my soul. I was completely changed.

The present church organizations of the world are facing a crisis. Why? Because we are not bearing the fruit of what Christ has taught us. But believing in the living God means to bring our lives up to God's standard. We must live in God at every moment and present our body and souls acceptable unto Him. We must ask God to capture our whole being and cleanse and purify us. . . . There should not be two gospels; individualistic and socialistic. If a man lives up to the cross of Jesus Christ, God is manifested in his own life.

After the Slav-Orthodox morning service, the Rev. Dr. Stefan Zankow, Professor at the University of Sofia, Bulgaria, made a remarkable address. Here are a few nuggets:

We find ourselves in the midst of a new era, a new Christian attitude to life, a revolution embracing the heart, spirit and indeed the whole life of the Christian. But at the same time, the more this new stream of Christian life deepens and extends, the more closely, on the other side, gather the clouds of darkness which seek to engulf the light. Over against the great and growing world-wide wave of Christian Truth,—there rise the diabolic forces of godlessness. Already the bands of Anti-Christians, numbering many millions, stand opposed to Christ and us. Can we, amidst this great conflict, afford to retreat, to stand aside or to hesitate?

We have before us two ways: the Way of Death and the Way of Life. The way of death is the way of turning our backs upon the eternal, of attack upon God, the way of sin, etc. The other way, the way of life, is the way of harmony with the eternal, of union with God in Christ, the way of forgiving love, the way of grace, etc. It is a battle for the Christian or Anti-Christian ethic. The question before us today is: Are we willing to do the will of God in Christ?

The Rev. Udo Schmidt of Germany, spoke on the challenging subject, "Christ, the Lord of the Ages." His introduction rings true:

We might hurriedly pass through the ages of the Church of Christ on earth. We might listen to the hymns of praise of the first Christians who adored Him. We might go back to the very beginning of the Church. We might lead you to the low catacombs or again to the massive Cathedrals. We might let pass before you its darkest oppressions or most radiant splendor, the rack and the funeral pyre, the narrow monastery cells or the iron barred prison chambers. And throughout this review of the past centuries we might readily show you that the song: "Christ Rules As King," never became silent.

We seek for more than the testimony of the history of Christ, we desire to see Jesus Himself. To point to His very person should be the aim of our endeavor. This requires from us to look into His Word. The Scriptures shall be the source and guide of this hour's discourse. In the very words of Christ, we find the key of our theme. We find them recorded by St. John in the very last book of the Bible. "And when I saw Him, I fell at His feet as dead. And He laid His right hand upon me, saying unto me, Fear not; I am the first and the last; I

am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death.—Rev.1:17,18.

It, the Word of God, wishes to tell us one thing. From out of Christianity we are led to Christ, from the circumference to the center.

To assent means to meet Christ the Lord of the Ages. As murmurs of life-giving water comes to us the word of Martin Luther: "This is the lovely joyful gospel of the Evangel of Christ which tells us what we have from this King. We have forgiveness of sins, deliverance from death, eternal justification and eternal life, all out of pure grace and mercy, without any merit in us, through Christ alone."

Spurgeon prays: "O Jesus, no one can conceive how great is the last of Thy reign and how rich the smallest of Thy gifts." John Wesley dies with these words on his lips: "I am the greatest sinner but Jesus died for me."

While some quarters still like to accuse the Germans of being in bondage to liberalism,—something which is not true to facts,—I submit this concluding statement of a German himself for the reader's consideration:

I conclude with two testimonials of German Christians. The first: It is a matter of death and life. The time is short and our resources are small. But Jesus truly lives with the whole fullness of His power, and it is wonderful to become a witness of the Heavenly King.

To this I would like to add a further word of Blumhardt: Believing people, followers of Jesus Christ, are such who carry within themselves the future of the Kingdom of God, who are willing to sacrifice for it their very person, in whom there is no looking backward or sideward, but only forward and to whom one thing is always certain: If we do not know what will happen, we are certain of one thing: *Jesus is the Lord!*

R. Erich Stange is one of the world's outstanding leaders in Y. M. C. A. work. He is also an eminent German theologian and church leader in his own country. He is an editor and a professor at the University of Leipzig, a conservative of conservatives, a Christ-believing Christian.

His address "A Handful of Dynamite" is worthy of publication in full in CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE. As for me I would challenge any "modernistic" theologian to refute his brilliant treatise on the subject, "A Handful of Dynamite." His text is, "The Gospel is the Power of God," and plays on the Greek original—*dynamis theou*—God's Dynamite. He says:

This hour is devoted to the discussion of the sources of power, and I may truly say that I know of no power stronger than this little book of the New Testament—this dynamite of God. We may speak of prayer as having been always a great source of power to the Christian, but which of us can speak with God until God has seen good to

speak to us? We may consider the art of gathering nuggets of gold—the gold of human virtue and righteousness, and fashioning from them a life as we fashion a vessel; but must not the stone first be split by dynamite before the gold can be found? Above all, however, when we think of our joint work, and of the power which we need to carry it on in this desperate hour of the world's Youth, we shall be driven back to the ultimate sources of power.

Let us not, then, waste our time on all kinds of other things, but let us speak of the decisive matter—the *Word of the Living God*.

You will not all believe what I have just said. I remember a talk with a young Secretary who led the work of some of the groups in one of our big Associations. He said to me: "Modern psychological research has proved that a young man who reads the Bible is no better than a young man without the Bible. So why should we take all this unnecessary trouble and spend so much effort in educating young men in Bible study?" This friend did not believe that the Word of God is dynamite. And he was honest enough to say so quite frankly. Perhaps there are many amongst us who think the same. And if we were to break down the walls of this hall by which we are so comfortably protected from the outer world, and were to call in the young people from the streets and show them this little volume—they would laugh in our faces, and say: "What's the good of your book? In the word of today what counts is a very different sort of thing!" So you see, I shall have to prove that the Word of God is dynamite.

When Paul made this claim for it 1900 years ago, it was no easy thing to prove. In the eyes of men the Gospel had as yet done but little. The small groups of Christians gathering here and there in obscurity in a handful of Mediterranean coast towns were of very little importance. There was still no question of the Gospel changing social conditions; for the moment it made no serious attempt even to abolish slavery. And there was no question of its exerting any influence on international relations. I imagine that the Emperor in Rome did not know that such a Gospel was in existence. There were some people who knew about this Gospel. They knew too that it was dynamite; they had experienced it in their own hearts, when the dynamite of God burst asunder the hard shell of self-seeking, guilt, and despair, and brought to light the new life of peace and consolation. Paul was one of those who had experienced this. Therefore he said: "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ." Therefore he called it "power of God."

He who has experienced this in his own life will need no proof.

Characters are many-sided—even Christian characters. A Christian character may well attract a young man's attention and make him ask what Christianity really is. But if he is a serious-minded young man, he will want to go to the root of the matter. And the root of the matter is not to be found in human character, but in the Word which reveals to us the mystery of God. You are making a grave pedagogical mistake if you trust to indirect results and neglect the direct.

Therefore once more I utter the accusation and the warning: "Woe to us if we play with the dynamite of God."

Unless we succeed in restoring the open Bible to the true place which it should hold in our organization, then sooner or later the end of our world brotherhood will come. And that is not the worst; the worst is, that in this hour of the world's history and of Youth there can be no more delay. Sinister forces from the depths of the peoples are moving against us. A great and decisive battle between the gospel and its enemies has begun, such as has not been waged for centuries. The Young Men's Christian Association will have neglected to give its message to the young generation and to the generation of tomorrow if it loses itself in mere activities or social service and forgets its royal service. Let us be bold in our attack upon the Youth of the World! *Let us throw God's dynamite into their midst, in His name!* Our message runs: Prepare a world revolution. Revolutions are not made with

words or gestures. Revolutions are made with dynamite.

I regret that among the mass of material given me by my good friends of the Wilmington Y. M. C. A., there are no addresses of the English and the French to be found. However, I was assured that they too struck a crystal-clear note!

I do know this: As the two local Y. M. C. A. leaders told me of their impression and as I read the rich information they so kindly put into my hands, one great thought made us one. It is this: "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, today, and forever."

Wilmington, Delaware

THE PULPIT

JAMES M. GRAY, D.D.
I. M. HARGETT, D.D.
ELMER ELLSWORTH HELMS, D.D.

FLOYD TOMKINS, D.D., LL.D.
MILTON HAROLD NICHOLS, D.D.
WALTER D. BUCHANAN, D.D., LL.D.

CLARENCE EDWARD MACARTNEY, D.D.
REV. CARLTON R. VANHOOK
THOMAS S. BROCK, S.T.D.

"He Healeth the Broken in Heart and Telleth the Number of the Stars"

CLARENCE EDWARD MACARTNEY, D.D.

He healeth the broken in heart and bindeth up their wounds; He telleth the number of the stars; He calleth them all by their names.—Ps. 147:3,4.

IN the lives of great men—men who were world-builders or world-shakers, or world saviours—we like to come upon some incident of tenderness or compassion which lets us know that this actor on the stage of world history was of like passions with the rest of humanity and had the heart of the common man. The inconsolable grief and remorse of Alexander the Great over his friend Clitus, whom he had slain in a moment of anger, interests us not less than the siege of Tyre or the battle of the Issus. We wonder at Martin Luther in his great moment at the Diet of Worms, when he took his stand for the Bible and the freedom of conscience; but we are also moved by his tears over the grave of his little daughter, Magdalena. Napoleon in Italy, or Russia, or Austria, or on the wave-beaten rock in the Atlantic, still casts a spell of fascination over the minds of men. But the student of Napoleon's meteoric career cannot forget the scene after the Battle of Aspern, in which

Marshal Lannes was mortally wounded; how Napoleon, forgetting the roar of the battle and the peril to himself and to his army, put his arms around the dying marshal and sat there by his side in silence as the tide of life ebbed. Lincoln, in the crisis of the nation showed a calmness and a patience which still is the wonder and admiration of men today. Yet, as well known as the Lincoln of the Memorial speech at Gettysburg and the Emancipation Proclamation and the Second Inaugural, is the Lincoln who sat on a box in the tent of a Vermont boy who had been sentenced to be shot for sleeping while on duty as a sentry. We take delight in discovering that the great can be tender and are moved with pity like the rest of men.

The Psalmist here brings into juxtaposition the greatness and the tenderness of God. What we observe on a finite scale in man, we behold to the infinite degree in God. He is the God who tells the number of stars and calleth them all by name, and yet the God Who heals the broken-hearted and bindeth up their wounds. The God Who has the power to uphold and regulate the stars and

the planets as they roll along their course is also observed of man. He knows individuals as He knows the names of the stars; and their sorrows He is able to assuage, their wounds to bind up, and their sins to forgive.

GOD AND THE UNIVERSE

God has no greater witness in the things of creation than the stars. There is a certain fitness in the sublime poetry of the Book of Job, that at the creation the morning stars sang together, as if the greatest of things material were celebrating the completion of God's work. On one of these sharp winter nights, obeying the voice of God to Abraham, we lift up our eyes towards heaven and behold stars like silver nails in the dome of blue. As we watch their slow and orderly procession across the campus of the heavens, as the earth wheels in its orbit; as we behold their vast host, and yet one star differing from another in glory, and are impressed by their grand silence, their brooding tenderness; and then remember that the stars at which we are looking are the very same which look down on men in the heart of Africa or in the islands of the sea, or in the polar regions; and still more, when we think that the stars which we behold are the very same stars to which God directed the gaze of Abraham; the stars that have looked silently down upon the flood, upon the rise and fall of Nineveh and Egypt and Babylon and Rome; the stars that brooded over Bethlehem or lighted the path of Columbus across the unexplored ocean, and under which Caesar, Hannibal, Napoleon, Luther, Cromwell were born or died—when we think of all this we are ready to join our voices with the inspired Psalmist and say, "The Heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth His handiwork."

The ancient writers knew far less about the heavens than the astronomers of our day know; and yet man everywhere has known and seen enough to tell him that the heavens declare the glory of God. A God Who can number and name the stars goes far out beyond our comprehension, just as the stars themselves do. Take our own Solar System, the sun and the eight planets which gather about it. This system alone to us seems vast, well nigh incomprehensible. While we spend this brief period in the house of God, the earth which is our home has been plunging forward on its 580,000,000 mile journey around the sun at the rate of 1,000 miles a

minute, and yet held true to its orbit by the gravitational pull of the sun. Of the eight planets, the earth, which is the third nearest to the sun, and therefore a near neighbor compared with Neptune, is nevertheless 96,000,000 miles from the sun. The greatest solar distance is from one side of Neptune's orbit to another, and it would take a shell fired out of the heaviest cannon five hundred years to traverse that space.

When we go outside our own Solar System, then the distance is infinitely increased. The nearest star, Alpha Centauri, is 25,000,000 million miles distant from the earth. It is estimated now that there are between two and three thousand millions of stars. To us, as we look at them on the winter night, they seem close together, but in reality they are so far apart that human arithmetic can hardly count the distance. The most distant stars of the Milky Way are calculated to be one hundred thousand trillions of miles distant from the earth. The successful measurements of the great star Betelgeuse make our vast sun look like a mere dot. Our sun is 860,400 miles in diameter, but it would take 27,000,000 of our suns to make one star like Betelgeuse, whose diameter is 300,000,000 miles. We boast of our aeroplanes, although almost every day we read of one crashing, with the immediate annihilation of all who sailed in it; but what shall we say of these great engines of the Creator? An aeroplane traveling at the rate of 100 miles per hour would require 1,000 years to circumnavigate a star like Betelgeuse, and that without stopping a second for the birth and death of successive generations of pilots.

When we have facts and figures like these pronounced to us, and then remember that we are dealing only with that universe which is visible to man's eye, or within the range of man's vision augmented by the most powerful lens, our mind begins to reel and we request the astronomer to roll up his chart and put a cap over his telescope and let our amazed and staggering intellects have rest.

Pascal, whose fine mind, like any great mind, is more wonderful than a star, somewhere has said that no canonical writer ever makes use of the natural world to prove the existence of a God. It is, indeed, true that the Bible assumes the existence of God and rarely, if ever, makes any argument for that existence. Yet we wonder if, when he made that statement about no canonical writer ever

using the natural world to prove the existence of God, Pascal had forgotten the words of St. Paul in the first chapter of his Letter to the Romans, where he says: "The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse." The natural conclusion from the vastness, the intricacy and the orderliness of the physical universe is that the world had a Creator. It does, indeed, take faith; yet faith here joins her voice with reason: "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the Word of God, so that things which were seen were not made by things which do appear."

In 1798, Napoleon set out on his expedition to Egypt. Much to the disgust of his soldiers and officers, he took with him a considerable company of scientists and philosophers. On a warm summer night these men were gathered together on the deck of the flagship. The heavens were brilliant, and these scientists were discussing whether or not the planets were inhabited. Some thought they were and others that they were not. Then they began to discuss the origin of the universe, most of them taking the position that natural law and phenomena were sufficient to account for the origin of the world without a divine Creator. Then Napoleon, who had been standing near them and silently listening to their conversation, introduced himself into the debate, and pointing with his hand to the brilliant host of the stars in the heavens, said: "Gentlemen, who made these?" A simple question, and one which went to the very heart of the matter. Who made the world? The world is a great effect, and common sense tells us it must have a sufficiently great cause. The world is not only a great effect, but it is an intelligent effect and must have had a sufficiently intelligent cause. Back of all nebular hypotheses, primordial germs and stardust, there lies some great secret, and the only key to it is the opening word of the Bible, "In the beginning God."

The spacious firmament on high,
With all the blue ethereal sky,
And spangled heavens, a shining frame,
Their great Original proclaim.
The unwearied sun, from day to day,
Does his Creator's power display,
And publishes to every land
The work of an almighty hand.
Soon as the evening shades prevail,
The moon takes up the wondrous tale,

And nightly to the listening earth
Repeats the story of her birth;
Whilst all the stars that round her burn,
And all the planets in their turn,
Confirm the tidings as they roll,
And spread the truth from pole to pole.

What though in solemn silence all
Move round this dark terrestrial ball?
What though nor real voice nor sound
Amidst their radiant orbs be found?
In reason's ear they all rejoice,
And utter forth a glorious voice;
Forever singing, as they shine,
"The hand that made us is Divine."

THE TENDERNESS OF GOD

The God who regulates the universe and holds the worlds in motion is He Who comes to heal the broken heart. "He healeth the broken-hearted and bindeth up their wounds." The Psalmist did not state the power of God to name and number the stars as an isolated attribute to God, but as affording assurance that the God who could roll the world along must have infinite resources and can know the names and minister to the needs of all mankind. God knows the names of all those stars which we see, and calls them by their names, not as we do, by the names of heathen gods and goddesses; but He also knows my name and beholds my necessity. Although I am one among the millions of human beings now alive, and one among the incalculable host of those who have lived and died on the earth, my individuality, personality are not lost. God knows my name.

At first, it might seem that the thought of the spatial vastness of the universe would serve to overwhelm man with the smallness of the planet which is his home and the insignificance of the being who dwells upon it. That, at first, was the impression of the ancient singer and star-gazer: "When I consider Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingers, and the moon and the stars which Thou hast ordained, what is man that Thou art mindful of him, and the Son of Man that thou visitest Him?" Then he reflects that God is mindful of man; that he has visited him with revelation and grace; that He has endued him with faculties which make him a little, if any, lower than the angels. "What a piece of work is man; how noble in reason, how infinite in faculty, in form and moving how express and admirable; in action how like an angel; in apprehension how like a god!"

There is nothing in the brilliance of the stars, and nothing in the vastness of the starry universe which eclipses the splendor

and the glory of man, because man is made in the image of God. Man may be small, and his world but a bit of dust, man's stay on earth but as the fraction of a second compared with the life of the briefest star that flames and then goes out, but man is greater than any star. Man can think about the stars, but the star cannot think about man. This has been wonderfully expressed by Pascal in his celebrated "Thoughts": "Man is but a reed, the feeblest thing in nature; but he is a reed that thinks. It needs not that the universe arise to crush him—an exhalation, a drop of water, suffices to destroy him. But were the universe to crush man, man is yet nobler than the universe, for he knows that he dies, and the universe even in prevailing against him, knows not its power."

Man is certainly worthy of intervention on the part of heaven. He certainly is in need of it, and Christianity is the record of that intervention. Something has happened to the world. God, indeed, is in heaven, but unless disease and injustice and cruelty and sorrow and shame and sin are right, all is *not* right with the world. To heal the world's hurt requires nothing less than the power of a God who can number and name the stars. The older theology emphasized more than we do the majesty and greatness of God. But perhaps for that very reason they emphasized more the redeeming love of God. The great truths of redemption have back of them the infinite power of Almighty God. An incarnation, an atonement and a resurrection are unthinkable, unless we are dealing with a God Who can number and name the stars, and therefore can heal broken hearts and redeem the world.

This is a broken-hearted world. Broken hearts are not as brilliant or visible as the stars which shine in heaven. But how numerous and universal they are. Here passes the regiment of those whose hearts have been broken by cruelty, injustice and oppression; and after them marches the regiment of those whose hearts have been broken by disappointment; and after them, the regiment of those whose hearts have been broken by hatred or unjust reproach, as the Psalmist said, "Reproach hath broken my heart;" and after them, the regiment of those whose hearts have been broken by affliction; and after them, the regiment of those whose hearts have been broken by treachery and desertion and love that is scorned. The mournful drum beat of the broken-hearted follows the sun in

its march around the world.

But in the Bible that phrase, "broken-hearted," has a special meaning. It implies a heart that has been broken in repentance over sin. So the great Singer and the great sinner has said in his prayer for forgiveness, "A broken and a contrite heart, O God, Thou wilt not despise." Only the great Physician Himself can minister to this kind of a broken heart. On the battlefield of sin man is not abandoned to the vultures of his remorse and despair. The great Physician comes to bind up his wounds and heal his broken heart. Only He whose own heart was broken on the Cross where he died for the world's sin has the authority or the power to heal the broken heart and bind up the wounded.

When he made his first public appearance in the synagogue at Nazareth, Jesus took the Scriptures and read the lesson for the day from the prophecy of Isaiah: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, for He hath anointed Me to preach the Gospel to the poor; He hath sent Me to heal the broken-hearted." That was a great text for the great sermon of Christ's life and passion. He had come to heal the broken-hearted. There is no truth that is so great or wonderful as the truth that God can forgive our sins. But back of it is the power of the Creator; and all the power of Him who can tell the number of the stars and name them is pledged to heal the heart that has been broken and in repentance and faith calls upon God.

The world has its darkness and its mystery, and there will be times when what happens to us will make the ordering of the world seem like an inscrutable riddle. Yet, back of it all is a heart of eternal love, and those who put their trust and faith in God will discover that what the Psalmist said is truth. He Who tells the number of the stars has healed the broken heart and bound up its wounds. What wound is there so deep or painful as the wound of sin? Who can heal it? Can science, can eloquence, can business, can the world's mirth or pleasure? All these are impotent before the wound of sin. There is only One who can heal that wound, and it is He Who upon Calvary's tree was wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities.

His very word of grace is strong
As that which built the skies;
The voice that rolls the stars along
Speaks all the promises.

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Current Religious Thought

The Bible Confirmed by Science

W. BELL DAWSON, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S.C.

V.

Nature as Variously Regarded

WE have so far looked into the great questions relating to creation, and the various views brought before us by Mythology, Evolution and Science, as well as the illumination which the Bible brings to bear upon the unity of Nature, and on the relation of God to the Universe and to Man, as the Creator of all things. We must now go on to the consideration of things as they are in the world around us at present; and the help towards a right understanding of this which comes to us from the knowledge that science can afford, with the fuller light that shines forth from the Scriptures. In taking this up, we are not entering into mere abstract comparisons or philosophic discussions of different points of view; for an outlook over the world reveals that vast populations at the present day are under bondage to superstition and fear; and how they can be delivered is an urgent question. Even in the most enlightened lands, there may be need for a better understanding of the relation of God to nature, and of man to his natural surroundings.

In dealing with superstition, which may go as far as witchcraft and magic, we find a wide ground of accord between Science and the Bible; for we can see at the outset that the teaching of both is directly contrary to all superstitious practices. It is also evident that the only means of getting rid of superstition, is by replacing it with something that is saner and better; and the scientist may therefore regard the Bible as his colleague in this matter, for it has the same end in view. We may take for an example the superstitious ways of warding off sickness and other kinds of "bad luck" by means of charms and incantations. Yet in dealing with such ideas, when we compare the methods of science with the teaching of the Bible, we will see that the Scriptures go far further than science can

reach, and cut so deeply as to destroy the root from which the trouble springs.

To understand therefore the way in which the Scriptures meet this need to overcome superstition and replace it with something better, let us look into them in an even-minded way; divesting ourselves of preconceived views or misconceptions, as far as we may be conscious of them. We will take the Bible just as it stands, to see how its statements bear upon this matter, and what remedy it offers for emancipation and deliverance from these errors.

Superstitious views and their Remedy.—It is very commonly thought that the nations which have most modern enlightenment have merely outgrown the superstitions of the olden days. For even science warns us not to expect any result from magic or the wearing of charms. Yet it may well be asked whether in reality this deliverance was not due to the Bible, which was accepted and believed in many countries before modern science arose. That this is the true reason, is strengthened by the fact that nations which are just as advanced, if we judge merely by their street cars and electric light, are still steeped in superstition, wherever the Bible is an unknown book. For the primary safeguard against superstition, is the doctrine of One Creator with everything under His control, which the Scriptures set before us from the beginning. This doctrine is an antidote (or more precisely a prophylactic) to keep men immune from its contagion.

It is also very remarkable, from any merely historical standpoint, that the Bible itself is so entirely free from superstition in all its forms. It is striking to find that the Prophets and others who wrote the Scriptures are so pure and true in their ideals, when during the centuries in which the Bible was written, these writers lived in a small land lying between powerful nations that were filled with superstition. They trusted to magical arts to obtain good luck through astrology, necromancy and such like. These things made up

the practical side of religion in their everyday life; for they had the standing of religious rites, just as auspices and auguries had in later times amongst the Romans.

These practices are frequently referred to in Scripture, in the descriptions given of the public or private life of the other nations. In Egypt or Chaldea, when any embarrassing difficulty arose which perplexed the ruler of the country, his first thought was to call together the sorcerers, the magicians and the astrologers, to meet the difficulty by their occult methods. (See Exodus 7:11 and 22, Daniel 2:1,2.) When Balak the king of Moab, wished to cast an evil spell upon the people of Israel, for the defense of his land against them, he used every artifice; by building seven altars as a lucky number, and so forth. Yet the Prophet showed him that it was all futile, saying: "Surely there is no enchantment against Jacob, neither is there any divination against Israel." (See Numbers 23:1, 2 and 23.) Later, in the Persian times, when Haman wished to destroy the Jews, he cast lots from day to day, from the first month to the twelfth month, to determine which day in the year would be a lucky one for the success of his scheme. (Esther 3:6, 7.) In the New Testament times, we read regarding the believers at Ephesus: "Many of them also which used curious arts brought their books together, and burned them before all men;" their value being fifty thousand pieces of silver. (Acts 19:19.)

Although such practices are referred to, all forms of superstition are denounced throughout the Scriptures. For where do they teach us an incantation against bad luck, or where do they tell us to divine the fate before us from the positions of the stars of heaven? Emphatic warning against all such things was given to the Hebrew people from the outset of their national career, after leaving Egypt: "There shall not be found among you any one . . . that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer. For all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord." (Deut.18:10-12.)* Any one who admires rational science, or even honest common sense, may therefore be satisfied that the Bible is in complete accord in these matters, with the views that he esteems to be reasonable.

It may well be considered that as things

now are in the world, the highest task of the enlightened nations, is the uplift of the great masses of humanity which live under the shadow of superstition and fear. Yet if such an endeavor is made, it soon becomes manifest that only those who trust implicitly to the power of the Scriptures as the Word of God, can hope to deliver others who "sit in darkness and in the shadow of death." When a motive is sought for making this endeavor, surely one of the strongest is compassion for those who are ignorant and out of the way; if we adequately realize the terror always before them that evil spirits will bring sickness and death upon their children, and ruin their crops; and the main object of their lives is to avert these evils, and propitiate the demons that are ever watchful to do them harm.

As one of the most practical examples of these ideas, we may consider the way that illness and disease are regarded in the darkness of paganism. In many lands it is believed that sickness is caused by a demon in possession of the invalid. To let the evil spirit escape, punctures and slits are made in the skin; and the "Medicine man" is sought, to give deliverance by his incantations. Any medicines used, must surely be regarded as charms; for an infusion from a rusty nail, a bird's claw and a dog's tooth, can only be a remedy that works by magic, like the water from a witch's cauldron. Can such ideas be dispelled by hygiene and hospitals alone? It is often found that native tribes regard the white man's medicine as merely a more potent charm than their own. It is clear that it is the mental attitude of such people that counts; they must be delivered from superstitious fear, for any permanent benefit.

How marked is the contrast with the teaching and the object-lessons of Scripture. We find there, first of all, that God upholds us in health; for when we read that "in Him we live, and move, and have our being," this must surely include our well-being. Regard for His laws therefore will prolong life, and self-indulgence and dissipation will prove our ruin; for the wicked "shall not live out half their days." It was promised to the Hebrew people, when leaving Egypt under God's protection: "If thou wilt diligently harken to the voice of the Lord thy God,—do that which is right,—give ear to His commandments,—keep His statutes,—I will put none of these diseases upon thee, which I have brought upon the Egyptians; for I am

* See also Ex. 22:18. Isa. 44:24, 25. Rev. 21:8.

the Lord that healeth thee." And amongst these laws were careful instructions on diet and hygiene, and the isolation of infected persons.* They were thus to look to God for health, by living in obedience to Him; and they were shown in the wilderness that when His protection was temporarily withdrawn, fiery serpents came in amongst them.

It is noteworthy that medical science is now recognizing so fully the importance of maintaining health; and the function of the modern doctor, beginning with the infant, is to steer those in his care along the lines of health, rather than merely to concoct drugs that will cure diseases, as in the old days. Even the effect of the mind on bodily ailments is coming to be admitted; which the Bible long ago pointed to: "A merry heart doeth good like a medicine," or as the Revised Version renders the original Hebrew expression, "A cheerful heart causeth good healing." (Proverbs 17:22.) Here then is a hint given in the Bible 3,000 years ago, in addition to the detailed instructions on health already referred to, which medical science is beginning to appreciate. Yet there is a higher aspect of the whole subject to which the Scriptures lead our thoughts; that in healing we should look beyond medical skill and the recuperative vitality of the body, to the power of God as our Creator.

How effective then is the remedy in Scripture for the superstition which manifests itself so conspicuously in combatting diseases by witchcraft, charms and incantations. We find in the Bible the most "advanced" methods of sanitation and the prevention of disease, dating back to the time of Moses; everywhere, in the Old Testament as well as in the New, there are strong warnings against dissipation and excess; the bearing of moral conduct upon disease is pointed out, and our responsibility to God to keep our bodies pure is emphasized; and above all, health and disease like life and death themselves, are in the hands of the Almighty Creator.† Much more might be said on the relation of a trustful Christian life to the maintenance of health and the cure of disease; but our present limit is to point out the accord between the Bible and the advance in the medical viewpoint in recent times. When we consider

the further heights in this direction which are reached in Scripture, we may well redouble our efforts to circulate the Bible in those lands where superstitions are dominant; especially when we know that "many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down in the kingdom of heaven; but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness,"—those who have treated the light of Scripture with criticism or indifference.

God and Nature.—The Scriptures, in the way that they regard nature generally and natural things and creatures, set before us a wide and exalted view; a view although not out of harmony with science, yet leaving no place for error; whether it be superstition, the multiplication of gods, or pantheistic ideas. The primary or underlying thought everywhere in the Bible where nature is concerned, is that God is the Creator of all things; and consequently that everything in nature is His. "The sea is His, and He made it; and His hands formed the dry land." It is He who "counteth the number of the stars, He calleth them all by names." All that occurs is referred directly to the agency of God. He rules the raging of the sea, and when its waves arise, He stilleth them; it is His sun that He makes to rise. He causes the streams to run among the hills, to give drink to the wild creatures; He gives us rain from heaven and fruitful seasons. The Lord Jesus expresses the same thought when He says that God clothes the grass of the field with flowers, and that God cares individually for His creatures; for no sparrow that falls to the ground escapes His notice.

There is surely nothing incompatible with the essentials of science in the view that all nature is thus in the hands of God, and that His power maintains the laws of nature in operation. Any people or nation that holds to this belief, keeps itself immune from superstition; and the superstitious outlook upon nature is what science so stoutly opposes. This view also depicts in the clearest way the unity of the universe, in which science must concur; and it places no obstacle in the way of research and investigation, for science can inquire freely into the secondary causes which lie between the Almighty and nature. In the Scriptures, these are usually overlooked; and the means which God may use to carry on the operations of nature, are not mentioned. Yet in ordinary language this is a common mode of expression, for we speak

* We would refer those specially interested to the following passages: Leviticus 11:9-19; 13:44-46 and 14:8, 9; 14:34-48; 22:8; Deuteronomy 23:12, 13.

† See such passages as Psalm 103:3, 4. Proverbs 23:29-32. I Peter 4:3, 4. Proverbs 7:10, 25-27. Hebrews 13:4.

exactly in the same way regarding human concerns. When we say that the manager of a business carries out some enterprise, or that a captain at sea navigates his vessel, all the subordinates and the mechanisms they manipulate are left unmentioned. How much more reasonable therefore are such statements regarding the Creator, who devised every detail by which all that occurs in nature is brought about?

Another feature of the Bible which should not be overlooked, is the careful avoidance of the personification of inanimate things or the forces of nature, even in poetical descriptions. This may be viewed as a safeguard against the idea that objects have any indwelling soul, in the Pantheistic sense; which might lead on to nature worship and superstition. There is no philosophical argument about such things in Scripture; but instead of this, the matter is set before us in its true light; which should not escape our notice. The flower and the stream, the wind and the rain, are not given human attributes, or imagined to have human feelings. It may be said of poetry in general that it is chiefly based upon such imaginative personification; for the poets speak of the sympathy of the stars in wishing to brighten our loneliness, or the daisies at our feet looking up with a cheering smile. Such things are not said in Scripture, because we are consistently taught that no inanimate thing has an independent intelligence of its own.

There is nevertheless in the Bible much of the finest poetry; and the marvel is that it can be so sublime without such reliance on personification as other poetry requires. For any personification, of the natural elements is only made in the presence of God, to show always that He is supreme. "Tremble, thou earth, at the presence of the Lord." "The floods have lifted up their voice; . . . the Lord on high is mightier than the noise of many waters." It is said to those who carry abroad the Word of God: "The mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands." Even this amount of personification of material things is rare; and more often, we find abstract ideas personified, as when "poverty comes as an armed man," or when "righteousness and peace have kissed each other; . . . and righteousness shall look down from heaven." Wisdom is personified: "Length of days is in her right hand; and in her left hand rich-

es and honor." The features of Biblical poetry thus touched upon, deserve to be noted by the poet as well as by the scientist; and especially the underlying reason for it, in giving no countenance to erroneous views of nature.

In looking into the attitude of the Bible towards nature, we thus see two aspects of the matter to begin with; and these lead on to a third which is the most important of all for it brings out the relation of God to man. So far, we have found that the Bible sets before us the direct relation of God to all that goes on in nature, and also that it carefully avoids any view of natural things which could possibly lead towards the idea that there is in nature any inherent mind or any capacity to act independently of God. With these underlying thoughts in mind, we perceive further that the object of the Bible in describing what occurs in nature is not merely for the sake of graphic and pictorial description, or even to exalt the power of God in the abstract; but the purpose is to bring man into touch with Himself. For we are shown that the power of the Almighty which we see around us, is at our disposal; the God of glory who thunders in majesty so that the cedars are broken and the wilderness is shaken, will also give strength unto His people, and bless them with peace; He who created the stars and because of the greatness of His might not one faileth, is the same also who gives power to the faint; so that they who wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength. By our contemplation of nature in the light of these sublime realities, our relation to God is made personal and present; for His mighty arm is stretched forth also in behalf of those who trust Him, to sustain and help. (Psalm 29:1-11. Isaiah 40:26-31. Isaiah 52:10.)

It is also made plain in the Scriptures, that faith in God may call forth His power for personal help or for the deliverance of His people. When the Philistines, adjoining the land of Israel, made an uncalled-for attack upon them, "the Lord thundered with a great thunder, and discomfited them." Or again, when a powerful nation like the Syrians made war upon the people of Judah, their army was destroyed in a night in response to the appeal of faith made by King Hezekiah. (1 Samuel 7:10 and 2 Chron. 32: 19-21.) A great illumination radiates from such events, in showing that the Almighty, as the Lord of nature, has means at His

command above human power, by which to deliver those who look to Him.

The power of God over nature is often set side by side with His ability to sway and control the actions of men, and turn them like the forces of nature to the fulfillment of His purposes. For example, when the people of God were to be released from their Captivity in Babylon, the Almighty raises up the monarch Cyrus to accomplish this by the same power that He put forth in creation; for He declares: "I have made the earth, and created man upon it; I, even My hands, have stretched out the heavens, and all their host have I commanded. I have raised him up (namely, Cyrus), and I will direct all his ways; he shall build My city (Jerusalem) and he shall let go My captives, not for price nor reward, saith the Lord of hosts." (Isaiah 45:1 and 12, 13.)

Divine arrangements.—We may also recognize even in the material universe, the planning of the Creator for the benefit of His creatures. At the beginning, the proportionate amount of the various elements and materials that compose the world is very remarkable, when we consider their suitability to the needs of men and other living things. For we must always remember that our furthest knowledge can afford no reason whatever, why things should not be very different indeed from what they are. The line of thought in Scripture is, that if God prepared the earth so wondrously for our welfare, should we not be grateful and praise Him for it; and may we not trust Him, now that we find ourselves in such a world. We are told that "God gives to all, life and breath," which opens up the question of how it is that the air is so proportioned that it is just right to breathe. It would take us a long way into chemistry and mineralogy to learn how this proportioning could have come about. Geology also brings out the purification of the air in past ages, to make it fit for the higher types of animal life.

This proportioning of the materials of the world and the foresight of the Creator in carrying it out, is referred to in the following passage: "Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of His hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance?" (Isaiah 40:12.) We will take up just one point in this widely suggestive statement; the measuring of the waters of the

earth. For we have examples before us in the solar system of a very different state of affairs. On the planet Mars, there are no rivers or seas; and the moisture it has is only sufficient to whiten its polar regions during its winter seasons.* Jupiter on the other hand, is low in weight for its immense bulk; for its size as we see it is due to a vast atmosphere of encircling cloud. To account for this light weight, it is calculated by a most competent physicist, Harold Jeffreys, that the solid core of Jupiter must be little more than half its diameter, and the sea around this 12,300 miles in depth, the rest being atmosphere.† If this earth had an ocean around it in the same proportion to its size, it would be slightly more than 1,500 miles deep; which would make any land surface for this world an impossibility.

We see then that there is no definite rule in regard to the amount of water that there ought to be upon a planet, between the two extremes of almost none or an ocean of enormous depth. Yet on this earth, the water surface is in good proportion to the amount of evaporation required for adequate rainfall upon the land. Such things as these deserve to be thought out instead of being merely taken for granted; and when science can give no reason or explanation as to how they came to be as they are, is it unreasonable to say with the Prophet, that they are due to the design and planning of the Creator?

The circuit of the waters in returning from the ocean to water the land does not escape notice in Scripture. "All the rivers run into the sea, yet the sea is not full; unto the place from whence the rivers come, thither they return again." (Eccles.1:7.) Rain is a witness to the goodness of God; who "gives us rain from heaven and fruitful seasons;" and it is counted as one of "the marvellous things without number" that He does send rain upon the earth, and waters the fields. For we read: "Are there any among the vanities (or gods) of the nations that can cause rain? . . . Art not thou He, O Lord our God? therefore we will wait for Thee; for Thou hast done all these things." (See Acts 14:17. Job 5:9,10. Jeremiah 5:24 and 14:22 R. v.) The great weight of the water car-

* Mars, though smaller than the earth, is weighty enough to retain all the water-vapor it ever had, without any evaporating into space; as explained by Jeans.

† See data in Paper: *On the Internal Constitution of Jupiter and Saturn*, by Dr. H. Jeffreys. Roy. Astron. Soc. Monthly Notices, Vol. 84, pp. 534-538.

ried by the clouds is also referred to. "He bindeth up the waters in His thick clouds; and the cloud is not rent under them." (Job 26:8.) This is no doubt poetically expressed; but the fact itself is none the less wonderful. For there are perhaps few who trouble to figure out that the weight of water is 72,600 tons per inch of rainfall on each square mile that the clouds water. That this water can float on the air at all, in the form of vapor, is a sufficient marvel; as we have already noticed. With all the progress of human invention, we may well turn our thoughts sometimes to such essential matters as the rainfall and the seasons which are beyond all our science to alter.

Our inability to modify the really important arrangements in nature, is often pointed out in the Bible; that we may realize our dependence upon God. The establishment of the seasons of the year is one of these arrangements which is very remarkable when we give thought to it. Everyone sees that the sun is higher in the sky in summer than in winter; and there are "turning points" (or tropics) in the sky where the sun turns at midsummer to go south, and again in winter to come north. Now, if the sun remained always over the equator, the northern and southern latitudes would not be warmed as they are, and much less of the world would be habitable. For in the far north, it does not matter how cold the winter is, if only there are warm days with long sunshine in the summer, to ripen crops. This is notably the case in Alaska, and the Canadian Yukon. We see at once the immense benefit of these seasonal changes to the world; and if we ask the reason, the astronomer tells us: Because the earth's axis is inclined to the plane of its orbit. Quite right, no doubt; but why is this so? It is by no means the rule in the solar system; and what caused the earth to revolve on an axis which is thus at a slant, and not square with its orbit as some of the planets are, we do not know.

There is a reference to this arrangement of the seasons in the Book of Job, where we read: "Knowest thou the ordinances of the heavens? Canst thou establish the dominion thereof in the earth?" (Job 38:33 R. V.) These *ordinances* are properly the *turning points* or "tropics of the heavens," where the sun turns in its annual course.* The

Creator "rejoices in the habitable part of His earth," and His arrangement of the seasons to this end, can no more be explained by modern science than in the days of Job. The challenge of the Almighty, "Knowest thou?" must still stand.

The way in which the Lord Jesus refers to natural things, is quite in keeping with the view presented in the Old Testament. For He refers to the birds that do not store up food and yet find sufficient in what God provides; to bring us to an attitude of daily dependence upon our God. This was impressed upon the Hebrew people at the outset, by the lesson of the manna in the wilderness; and we are still taught to pray: Give us day by day our daily bread; while we look to Him who feeds the young ravens which cry, and opens His hand to satisfy the desire of every living thing.

Human workmanship, as well as knowledge and ability, are also contrasted with the works of God in nature, when the Lord tells us that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of the wild lilies with which God clothes the grass of the field. For in all fabrics, excellence is reckoned by their fineness of texture; and if we make the test by the microscope of science, it only reveals the coarseness of our silks and satins while it enhances the beauty of structure in the petal of a flower. It is the same with the glory of coloring; for it is singular that certain colors which offend the eye if put together in clothing, seem always to harmonize in nature; where near shades and strong contrasts are alike pleasing. Even the analysis of the colors by the spectroscope cannot explain why this is. So our most skillful weaving and dyeing are still far from equaling the handiwork of God; and the words of Christ are as forceful as ever, as a basis for His profound teaching.

The Power of God in its higher aspects.—We can readily perceive the three-fold purpose in the Scriptures, when they bring before us the mighty power of God in controlling all things in nature. (1) This conception dispels effectively the false views of superstition, as we have seen; and the Bible is thus an illumination for all nations that sit in darkness. (2) The power and wisdom of God are placed in contrast with our own limited apprehension and our restricted powers, notwithstanding the vaunted ability of man to devise and invent. For the advance of science is impressing upon us that all the

* This is confirmed by the Septuagint translation; often an excellent commentary in showing how the Hebrews of old understood the Scriptures; for in it, the Greek word *tropics* is here used.

discoveries which we can make by research, are only "parts of God's ways" and "a little portion" or "a whisper" that is heard of Him; but "the thunder of His power who can understand?" (Job 26:14 and R. v.) When there is thus so much in nature that "is past finding out," we are led on to trust the providence of God even when we cannot understand; as the Book of Job teaches at length. (3) When the power of God in nature is depicted to us in Scripture, it is not to terrify and to over-awe us, but to encourage our faith and trust in the Almighty Father who, with the universe at His command, is willing to help those who look to Him. Yet while superstitious fears are thus excluded and made irrational, those have reason to fear who disregard God, and who have turned every one to his own way; for it is the Lord Jesus who gives this plain warning to His disciples: "Fear not them that kill the body, . . . but rather fear Him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." (Matt.10:28. See also Luke 12:4,5.)

This same Divine power which is displayed in nature and in providence, can rise to a higher level still for the help of man in the spiritual realm. The need of such strengthening is very evident; for if morality is to advance, there must be power to do right. There may be an excellent code of morals, such as even a pagan philosopher may be able to devise, like Confucius or Marcus Aurelius. But without motive-power or energy, any such system is dead and helpless. The Scriptures themselves acknowledge that if a man is to be consistently moral, and overcome temptation and advance spiritually, it can only be by means of power from on high. We find accordingly that this is a dominant note in the prayer of the Apostle on behalf of converts from paganism; that they may have the needed enabling to do the will of God:—

"We do not cease to pray for you, and to desire that ye might be filled with the knowl-

edge of His will . . . being fruitful in every good work . . . strengthened with all might, according to His glorious power." "The eyes of your understanding being enlightened, that ye may know . . . what is the exceeding greatness of His power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of His mighty power which He wrought in Christ, when He raised Him from the dead, and set Him on His own right hand in the heavenly places." And again: "I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that He would grant you . . . to be strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man." For He "is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us." (See Col.1:9-11; Eph.1:15-20; and 3:14-21.)

This communication of Divine power, put forth on behalf of man, to enable him to live soberly, righteously and godly, in this present world, is a great outstanding reality which the Scriptures abundantly declare. It carries our conception of power into realms which are above the level that science can reach; yet it is surely in accord with the manifestations of energy on the physical plane of action.

What the Bible therefore teaches by direct statement and by illustrative examples, is that the moral and spiritual power of God is manifested in Christ and can be communicated to us through Him. He made this claim Himself, when He said: "All power is given unto Me, in heaven and on earth." Also, in passages where the various aspects of Divine energy are explained, the great motive power of gratitude to Christ is included,—gratitude for what He has accomplished on our behalf. We find accordingly that the name of Christ is frequently used by itself, to include all that He has done, the motives in us that result, and the power to work out right living. Christ sums this up Himself, in His own statement: "Without Me, ye can do nothing."

Montreal.

Christmas Presents!

What could be more appropriate than a year's subscription to CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE! A monthly reminder of the kindness and thoughtfulness of the donor! But what means even more: It is the *best* remembrance, for it has an abiding interest! We still send the October, November and December numbers FREE to all new subscribers for 1932!

The Real Jewish Crux To-day

PROFESSOR HERBERT W. MAGOUN, PH.D.

FROM his own day until now, "What think ye of Christ?" has been a *crux* to the Jews. They knew then and have always known that He was not the son of Joseph. This is made clear in various ways. The insult in John viii:41 has not been understood, but it tells the tale for all that, since it implies that He was begotten in sin, has two fathers, and cannot be a son of God, or true Israelite, because He is beyond the pale. Joseph was his foster father only, though he gave Him his name in conformity with Jewish custom, making Him a Bar-Joseph, a Son-of-Joseph, or a Josephson, as Luke implies (iii:23), for the true meaning of that verse is this, "being, as the custom was, a Son of Joseph." The Greek has no "the," and the verb is idiomatic, meaning, "as the custom was."

There can be no question whatever about the custom, as most Old Testament names conform to it, and it still persists in Samaria. Peter's name was Simon Bar-Jonah, and it agrees perfectly with the Jewish manner of naming children. Zerubbabel was the nephew, not the son, of Shealtiel (1 Chron.iii:19), but he passed into the royal line and thus became a Ben-Shealtiel, or Son-of-Shealtiel. The lack of any "the" in such Hebrew names should have been noticed by the men who translated the Scriptures, but it never was to all appearance, and the Hebrew custom was therefore never recognized. If Joshua Ben-Nun had been kept instead of being rendered "Joshua the son of Nun"—they always manage to insert a "the"—the situation might have been understood! It never has been.

The Old Talmud—late editions omit the passages—calls Jesus a Ben-Stada and makes him out to be illegitimate, according to the testimony of different rabbis, and some of the things said belong in the first century of our era. The *Toldoth Jeshu* is late, but it reflects Talmudic opinion and calls Him a *mamzer w-ben ha-niddah*, which means that He was not only illegitimate but was begotten in uncleanness. The Ben-Stada is supposed to be of uncertain meaning, but side lights from different sources make it clear that "Son-of-a-harlot" was its true significance. The other term, Ben-Pandera, or Ben-

Panthera, is probably, in spite of vigorous denials, a corruption of the Greek, meaning, son of a virgin. Pandera is thus supposed to be the name of his real father, his second one.

His claim to divinity is included in the attacks in the Talmud and is called a lie, for the story of the virgin birth was never accepted as anything more than a yarn to cover up sin, by the "orthodox" among the Jews, and the same attitude has been maintained down through the ages. His character was not assailed, his miracles were freely admitted, though attributed to Egyptian magic through the use of *ha-Shem* (the Name, JHVH, YHWH) obtained by deceit and craft, and assaults against Him were concentrated on his birth; for an illegitimate son has no standing among Jews but is beyond the pale, an outcast, an untouchable, so to speak, and unworthy of any consideration.

The contradictory elements in the situation have puzzled modern Jews, somewhat as contemporaries were puzzled by the incident of the man born blind, as related in the ninth chapter of John. As a result, it has been assumed that the whole story was a myth and that no such person as Jesus ever existed. Strenuous efforts to prove this assertion have followed, and some have taken the matter seriously. Only recently, a Jewish scholar was so impressed by it that he undertook an extensive study to find out the truth. His results fill a book of 666 pages, in which he effectually demolishes the myth notion but hardly improves the Jewish position. It will be considered below.

Another Jewish scholar, Joseph Klausner, Ph.D., of Palestine, when convinced of the historicity of Jesus, wrote a book entitled "Jesus of Nazareth." It is, in effect, a laborious attempt to discount his teachings and his works. The myth idea would not work. There was too much evidence to the contrary. Moreover, the character of Jesus furnished an argument so potent that the assaults on his birth became evidently so malicious that the Jews themselves could no longer stand for them, and it began to be noised abroad that He was a prophet, a good man and a brother. Some went so far as to call Him, "our brother Jesus."

The logical result was a search for means to account for Him and his teachings. An attempt to do just that was made by Vladimir G. Simkhovitch in a little book called "Toward the Understanding of Jesus." It sought to make out that He was a natural product of his times and environment. Another Jewish book by Hugh J. Schonfield is entitled "The Lost 'Book of the Nativity of John.'" Its animus is essentially the same. Jesus was a man, He was deified by his disciples, an explanation must be found for the four gospels, they had some documents behind them, and those documents were appropriated and made over by Christians! The documentary idea is modern method transplanted to the first century, when men did not work in the modern way but depended on living witnesses and their own memories for what they had to say in what they wrote.

Exploiting the same general idea, Robert Eisler, Ph.D., substitutes "a lost *Vita et Passio Sti. Johannis Baptistae*" after rejecting Schonfield's notion, which evidently did not go far enough to suit his own purpose. His book is entitled "The Messiah Jesus," but it must not be supposed that he accepts Jesus as the Christ. Far from it, he means merely the Jesus *called* the Messiah, for he uses "Messiah" as an adjective very much as Josephus uses the Greek word *Christos*. Neither dreams of confessing Christ by the words used.

The book itself is the most elaborate, erudite, ingenious, subtle, sophisticated, and, on the surface, plausible attack yet made on Christian documentary evidence and on Christ Himself. The English edition has xxviii + 638 pages, or 666 in all. The German one is even longer and more bulky. Extensive illustrations reproduce facsimiles of manuscripts in Greek, Hebrew, etc., and no pains are spared to defend the author's thesis and convince the reader.

His general attitude and the basis upon which he worked are well expressed in the following paragraph:

Since whatever is handed down about supernatural beings cannot be history, but mythology, saga, or legend, it follows that no amount of rationalizing Euhemerism will ever recover an historic account of Jesus the *man* from Gospels the obvious tendency of which is to present him as the Super-human Christ, the son of God. Such an account can only be obtained if we base our investigations, in the first instance, on that modest quarto page of non-Christian *testimonia*, whose whole aim is to

speak of him as a man in express denial of the Gospel claims, adding then, in the second instance, any such features in the Christian tradition as will be found consistent with the picture thus recovered. If this method be followed, it will at once appear that the common opinion, according to which those *testimonia* do not yield anything of great importance, is not at all well founded. (p. 7f.)

It is here assumed that the gospel story cannot possibly be true except in those places where nothing supernatural is involved. No such limitation is put upon any hostile testimony. That is taken at its face value regardless of the strong probability that it is untrue in some respects if not in its entirety. The fact that it is hostile is enough to prove that it is not accurate testimony, for it cannot be hostile and still be unbiased, as even a child must see. If friendly testimony is not unbiased, hostile certainly is not, and it should be taken with the utmost caution. Instead of doing that, this author welcomes the testimony of all hostile witnesses with open arms.

Naturally, he does not believe that Josephus wrote the passage concerning Jesus in its present form. He abandons the usual line of attack, rejects the conclusions reached in that way, and instead of cutting down the passage expands it so as to make it derogatory. He then assumes that Christians have deleted enough of the original to obtain the present text, which, so far as known, is found in every extant Greek manuscript. How His supposed changes could be made with never a trace being left in any document or tradition, whether pagan, Jewish, or Christian, he does not explain, but explain it he must, if his dictum is to rank any higher than a mere subjective personal opinion.

The truth is that altogether too much has been attributed to the Josephus passage. The pronoun which he uses in mentioning Jesus as the "Christos" may express contempt, and that is enough to show that he was not recognizing Him as the Messiah but was merely identifying Him as he does about a dozen others named Jesus. This Jesus was the Christos one, is what he means, and no more than that should be put into his statement. It is entirely possible that the word for Jesus has been dropped in the passage, because, while it seems to be needed to make the sense clear, such an adjective use, although perfectly normal in the early ages, would come to seem odd in a few centuries, because the word for Christ had become essentially a proper name.

That amount of deletion may be freely admitted along with the loss of an indefinite pronoun at the beginning, for which he has some evidence. The insertion of those two words, both of which have a rational explanation, is enough to meet all his difficulties and objections, since they show conclusively that Josephus did not recognize Jesus as the Messiah. As to the notion that he did recognize Vespasian as such, which this author accepts, it is little short of amazing that a Jew who ought to know better entertains any such opinion. The Messiah not only had to be a Jew but he also had to be a lineal descendant of David. How, then, could Vespasian, who was neither, be accepted as such?

What Josephus actually says is that Vespasian fulfilled an obscure oracle, found also in their sacred writings, and that they misinterpreted it—foolishly and wilfully. (*Wars*, VI. v.4.) There is no suggestion of any Messiah idea in his words but rather a disparagement of the entire notion.

As to the contention that Eusebius had no "standard text," based on the fact that his three citations of the passage concerning Jesus differ slightly in details, it is enough to remember that he obviously quotes from memory—the fact is patent—and therefore does not succeed in quoting exactly, though the differences are not important. Origen was long supposed to be ignorant of the passage, but it is now clear that he was not and simply took it as Josephus meant it to be taken. If the two deleted words should be restored, the original reading could be freely rendered thus:

And at about that time there became prominent a certain Jesus, a wise man, if at least it is required to call him a man, for he was a doer of extraordinary works, a teacher of men who are eager to receive the truth, and many Jews, on the one hand, many of the Greek race, on the other, he won over. The "Christos" Jesus, this guy was. And Pilate having condemned him to the cross at the instigation of the chief men among us, those who were devoted to him at the start did not cease to be so; for to them he appeared living again, holding fast to a third day, the divine prophets having told both this and countless other wonderful things about him. And to this very day the tribe of Christians named from this fellow has not ceased to be.

This states in a rather jocular fashion facts well known to every one in the days of Josephus. It is half in jest and half in earnest, and Origen rightly understood it. If such a contention seems odd, remember that the *Toldoth Jeshu* freely admits several times that Jesus raised the dead and cured

lepers, although its whole object is to disgrace Him utterly. The inconsistency of such a combination never troubled the Jews, and this passage in Josephus probably never did, until, two words having been lost, the Christians began to use it as a weapon against Jewish opposition to Christianity.

Dr. Eisler is right in supposing that Josephus found the facts distasteful and did not intend to exalt Jesus; but he forgets that Josephus had promised to tell everything exactly as he found it and so could not fail to put in something—as little as he could—about Jesus, without really taking sides against Him. It was enough to put things in a way that could be taken about as the reader liked. To some, "those eager to receive truth" would mean one thing, to others the sense would be gullible people. He did not believe, but he did know that such things had taken place and that they were widely claimed as a fulfilment of prophecy. He could admit that much and not commit himself.

On the other hand, Dr. Eisler's contention that the passage was originally considerably longer and distinctly derogatory is entirely unjustified. It necessarily involves literary impossibilities. Such a making over as he demands never could have taken place with the help of Constantine and all the rest without arousing intense hostility among both Jews and Romans, and Jews have long memories. They would have discovered any such alterations and kept the story of it alive just as they did the slanders about the birth of Jesus.

To them, as to countless others, the virgin birth seemed impossible, and they therefore assumed, knowing full well that Joseph was not his father, that He was an illegitimate child. That supposition put Him beyond the pale and rendered it quite impossible for them to see in Him anything more than a remarkable man. That He could be the Messiah, the universal king, seemed utterly preposterous. To them, the kingdom of heaven did not mean something within the hearts of men, where the Messiah was to reign supreme, but an earthly kingdom ruled over by Jews as the supreme chosen race. For that reason, the Christian idea became an offense to them and one impossible for a Jew to entertain.

This will explain much in Jewish literature that now seems puzzling, these books of

disparagement, exalting John the Baptist to the detriment of Jesus, those seeking to account for Him in natural ways, and those trying to prove Him quite different from what He was, of which the one under discussion is the most prominent and the most scholarly. It avowedly follows the methods of the higher critics and therefore assumes that the "attentive reader," the "unprejudiced reader," the "unbiased reader," and the "intelligent reader" will agree with him! That he has a most pronounced bias himself never seems to have entered his head. Nor does it ever appear to have occurred to him that many an intelligent reader will be keen enough to see that his methods can have but one result—the one he really wants to obtain!

He classifies Jesus as a member of a wandering pacifist Bedouin tribe, whose members wear the mark of a cross in their foreheads, denies that they had a Christian origin, makes Jesus out to have been a Rekhabit, and finally says:

I venture to submit . . . that the well known pacifist doctrines of the wandering carpenter Jesus are ultimately derived from the special experiences of those nomad craftsmen, who from remote ages . . . have successfully fought their way . . . by such an attitude of radical pacifism and willing service toward all. (P. 344.)

That Jesus never taught pacifism but did teach righteousness at any cost is another thing which seems to have utterly escaped his observation. He thinks that Jesus was honest but deluded, represents Him as short, hunchbacked, and ugly all but his eyes, and freely perverts various passages in different authors, including some in the Gospels, to support his contentions. Some things which he thus perverts are the result of an inability to see things from two different standpoints, one party seeing one side of a thing and another seeing another and a different side. Why not, when the thing is so common?

With this curious view of Jesus, as the Jew has always seen Him, contrast his conception of God, the Creator, the Almighty, the Omniscient One, the Supreme Ruler of the universe, the Deity so majestic, so awful in majesty, so glorious in holiness, so exalted in state that a man committed sacrilege if he presumed to pronounce the divine name. To this day an orthodox Jew will speak of the tetragrammaton, meaning the name written as JHVH (YHWH), rather than say Jehovah. He will substitute Adonay

wherever the four letters appear in his Scripture reading and never venture to do anything else. He reverences God as a being so infinitely above himself that he hardly dares to approach Him.

Coming in contact with gentile theology, he finds Jesus spoken of as God manifest in the flesh. To Him that means that Jesus is God. Is it to be wondered at that he finds Christianity a hopeless puzzle and regards the worship of Jesus as idolatry? The crucifix is to him anathema. He regards it as a religious duty, if he is orthodox, to call down a curse from God on churches in which he beholds a crucifix. It symbolizes to him the unpardonable sin of idolatry, and he wishes to be guiltless of that sin. Nay more, he wishes to show his zeal for God by his hatred of every form of idolatry.

Many Jews have become Christians, and they make devoted disciples, but this *crux* of the "illegitimate" Jew being worshiped as God appalls many more, and they shake their heads and find it impossible to accept the Christian idea. Many of their leaders in Europe still hope for a restored Israel with a rebuilt temple and renewed sacrifices, but the younger Jews see that any such idea is now an impossible one, and they are at a loss to know what to do or think. The orthodox ritual calls for a reading in Hebrew, for prayers and psalms in Hebrew, and leaves the congregation without any spiritual help.

Revolting against such conditions, recent generations have demanded something more of their rabbis, a sermon in the vernacular, some prayers in it, and some sort of help like that afforded by Christian worship. Progressive rabbis have recognized the justice of such demands and have tried to meet them; but conservatives have fought them bitterly in any attempt to meet the situation. Some have urged and tried to map out some sort of a compromise; but such efforts are apt to be only partially successful.

A movement to recognize Jesus as a prophet has gained remarkable strength of late years, and that helps to account for his place in contemporary Jewish documents. Some go a step further and find in Him more of God than in any other man. These become Christians in effect and sometimes in name; but they still reject Christian theology which makes Jesus God incarnate. That doctrine has certain terrors for them; and they draw back with a shudder when contemplating

it. Will God forgive such presumption? They do not know and are afraid to assume the risk of embracing teachings that seem blasphemous to them.

Material things had already assumed such proportions in Jesus' day that the Jews could not understand the remark, "The kingdom of God is within you." An internal kingdom of the heart in which obedience was gladly rendered because of devoted love for the king was foreign to their thought. Pomp and majesty, vast physical power, wealth and honor, with themselves sharing in the outward prosperity, these were the things that they saw in the kingdom of God on earth. A Messiah that was such because He lived and died for men was outside of their comprehension. The picture in Isaiah was too much for them, and a "scapegoat Messiah" was postulated to meet the difficulty. Now and then some young rabbi would see the truth, seek for light at the hands of Christian ministers, and go over to Christianity. He was mourned as dead, ceased to be a Jew, and suffered all that he could be made to suffer at the hands of other Hebrews.

Before we can hope for the general conversion of the Jews, this terribly real *crux* must be recognized and a way found to meet it. Reform movements among them are really futile; for the best they can do is to assume that Judaism is somehow to go on and expand, but how? Many recognize the fact that the old regime in the temple in Palestine has been abolished forever. A little handful of Samaritans still observe that ritual faithfully, but their days are numbered, and they have almost abandoned all hope. How completely Jesus fulfills the needs of Jewry and how abundantly He satisfies the soul hunger of trusting Jews is a factor in the situation which they cannot recognize.

Two irreconcilable things, as they see matters, must be reconciled, and they cannot find the way out. Some of them clearly recognize that the "liberals" as they call them are really bringing up the question whether Jesus was, after all, a *mamzer*, or bastard, and whether it may not be possible that He was the long awaited Messiah. "In his name shall the gentiles trust" finds its fulfilment in Christianity, for there is no disputing the fact that the gentiles do trust in the name of Jesus. Once let the Jews realize that the virgin birth was a reality, that Jesus was the Son of God in very truth, that He died to save them and

will welcome them into his kingdom, and the results will startle the entire world. The great problem is how to help them to see the point.

The first difficulty is to make Christians see it. Their "liberals" are going straight into the rabbinical camp; for the inevitable outcome of their belief puts Jesus into the very category in which the Jews have classed Him for ages. They have never made the mistake of regarding Him as the son of Joseph, and they never will. Every scrap of testimony, both Jewish and Christian, denies any such possibility, and they know it—have always known it. How blind, then, are the men who fancy themselves of superior acumen by postulating such a solution of their difficulty! The stupendous claims of Jesus mean just one of two things, either He was the Son of God and the Messiah, or else He was the most egotistical of beings, the most deluded of the human race, the most presumptuous of fakirs, and the greatest fraud in history. Can you fit such defects into his amazing character?

Belmont, Massachusetts

No Right to a Wrong Opinion

Anent to the matter of having a right to my own opinion, as some claim, and as I read, I believe, in a recent issue, may I quote this:

In the days of the sixteen to one controversy in the nineties, we had a famous editor here, Mr. Harvey Scott. One day an ill-informed man tried to argue with him on the advocacy of fiat money, but being worsted, retorted, "Well, Mr. Scott, I have as good a right to my opinion as you to yours." To which Mr. Scott made this electrifying reply, "No sir, you have not; you speak from the standpoint of presumption and emotion without knowledge, without judgment. I speak from the basis of painstaking and laborious study. You have no right to an opinion on this subject because you have not given yourself the labors which alone can justify an opinion. It will be time enough for you to boast that you have a right to your opinion when you have brought to the subject a teachable mind and when you have mastered the elementary fact."

Sure enough. No one can have a right to a wrong opinion or belief!—*G. H. Lee.*

Portland, Oregon

A Divine's very Liberal Views on Christ

THE LATE JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER, D.D., LL.D.

THE author is disgusted with the idea that the Eternal Son of God could exist in embryo in the womb. That objection springs from two causes, the modern emphasis on Jesus as man only, and an inheritance of an exaggerated or too massive or materialistic view of the threefold personality of God. Before he was incarnated the Son of God was not separated from the Father as one man is separated from every other man. He was a Person, yet not a person, the Son Element or Moment in the Triune God, and he was not transferred from God to Mary, so that there became a change in God's nature. The Son emptied himself and became thus incarnated as an historic person, but he was still in and with God. Author says Jesus was not Son of God when a child, nor Redeemer, but only when grown up. This is like saying that Napoleon was not Napoleon when a boy. Of course he was not the conquerer at Austerlitz when a boy, but he was the same person who later had the most of Europe at his feet. So Christ had the essence of Sonship of God as a boy, the potency of Saviourhood then, but not the developed activity, not the full exercise.

Author quotes the well known words of Tertullian, the Christian Father, "Indeed it is credible because it is inconsistent," as though it referred to the incarnation, coming of Christ to earth, whereas it refers to his death. What the great Latin Carthaginian says is (about 208): "It is not to be ashamed of because it is a matter of shame. The Son of God died: indeed it is credible because it is inconsistent. He was buried, he arose: it is certain because it is impossible" (*De Carne Christi*, 5 in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* tom. ii, col. 761). That is, what to you is impossible is certain to us because we know our premises are true.

The idea of humiliation of the Son (Kenosis) while still sharing in some sense the glory of the Father is thought too dualistic and as derogating from reality of sacrifice. But it is incontestable that while on earth Christ was conscious of being one in the life and knowledge of the Father (Luke 10:22). And while living on earth as still inhabiting heaven (Jno.3:13, comp. 1:51). So you could think of the poor scholar, who in his hovel

still revels among his books and communes with the intellectual elite of the ages.

It is objected that Kenosis (emptying) or incarnation, which is the theory of Trinitarians, brings the Trinity to naught, which is assumed to be the necessary mode of existence of God; whereas Kenosis, it is said, practically annihilates the second member of it for some months or years of his mundane existence. But it must be remembered that Kenosis is referred to as Christ's slave estate and especially his death, not to his prebirth or early days (Phil.2:5-8), and is not inconsistent with the experiences mentioned a moment ago or the Son's secure place in the life of deity. Of course God the Father cannot choose a mode of existence, because he eternally and necessarily has his mode of existence, but the Son can choose to be Saviour in the only way in which the entrance of sin into human history made possible and necessary.

It is objected that Kenosis (real incarnation) is an insoluble speculative puzzle. Well, it is hardly courteous to use the word "puzzle," but if you use it, I say all questions on God are insoluble speculative puzzles, and are therefore answered in a hundred ways by as many philosophers and students. But it is really no more mysterious or "puzzling" to postulate an infinite personal eternal God and Creator as author does, than to postulate a complex unity in his being ("Trinity"), and that for our salvation that so-called Person in the unity which is called the Son was incarnate in the historic Jesus for our salvation. And this last thought has this advantage for evidence that it has the historical facts of the Saviour's consciousness and life.

It is objected that Kenosis (incarnation) presupposes that a divine being can cease to exist. Author infers that somebody believes that say between the Son's life in and with God the Father and the time of the self conscious life of Jesus there was an interval of actual cessation of being. Such a cessation is of course impossible in God. Author is right, and he speaks of ovum, embryo, and all that. But where did he get the idea that Christ or Paul or Church ever taught that the Saviour ceased to exist in the embryonic or any other process? Professor Louis M.

Sweet is absolutely right in saying that all that foetal and child life belongs to the Jesus of history not to the eternal Son who came in Him. He though incarnate never lost his place in the ineffable glory of the eternal. When we say that he became man we do not mean that he transformed himself into an embryo, but that he united himself with the inmost consciousness of Jesus as that unfolded, so that the result of that one Person was Son of Man, Son of God. That was the slave estate which Paul calls the emptying (Kenosis). When the hymn Te Deum Laudamus (6th century) says, "Thou didst not despise the womb of the Virgin," that is poetic, and is to be interpreted in full accord with the words of author who in giving his own view unconsciously gives the church view. Of course when the Word took flesh it did not mean that the Logos became an impersonal nonhuman "It," germ, embryo, as author implies the church assumes. The embryo developed into Jesus, and the Son became man not in the embryo but in Jesus. Kenosis was not metabolism or transfusion or metamorphosis or transmutations, much less cessation of being and then starting to be again, but was incarnation, the taking (*λαβών*) the form of slave *μορφήν δουλοῦ* instead of the previous form of God (*ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων* where word translated form means much more than shape, but rather state or estate). For purposes of salvation the Son in incarnation or Kenosis laid aside temporarily one estate, but he "took" another, the Emptying was a Filling, God adding Man. That is Paul's thought.

It is objected that Kenosis means that God can forget or choose not to know, and that since this is impossible the church view of incarnation is untenable. Author is right that the only thing that God cannot know is the thing that cannot be. But since Christ did not know anything when a babe nor everything when a man, there was no incarnation in the sense of the church. Here again author mistakes Paul's and Church's view of Kenosis. The author should have studied the history of doctrine twenty years more before he wrote his book. The early Church never thought that the Son was flung off from the Father as another God, as another star from central star mist, and so revolved around him as an independent entity or God; but it thought of the Son as forever existing in and with the Father, his knowledge, his

life, all his being, dependent absolutely and always on the Father. And as to incarnation it did not think of this Son "reducing himself to a span," shortening himself to an embryo (so to speak), but as the historic Jesus developed in his earthly life, as his inmost being grew, expanded, etc., the Eternal Son incorporated himself with this Jesus, and without losing his relation to the Father became actually incarnate in him. Jesus was not the Father transformed, as the Patripassian Monarchians of the last part of the 2nd century thought; nor a man made the Son by the Father enlightening, finishing, empowering him at his baptism, as the Dynamistic Monarchians at the end of the same century thought; not a man of fine spiritual endowment who by that fact was able to receive the life and light and life of the Father ("God"), thus to "reveal God" show how much this God loved man, as most so-called modernists think; not as a person in whom God or the Son of God dwelt, that is, in his subconsciousness, as Sanday thought; not as individual in whom two persons existed side by side, God or the Son and Christ. But Jesus the Son of Mary (whether by miraculous or natural birth, see my pamphlet on that published by Cokesbury Press, 810 Broadway, Nashville, Tenn., 1924, 25c) was also the Son of God: that eternal Son became a part or element in the ever dawning consciousness of him, in all his mental, moral and spiritual powers. The Emptying or Kenosis or incarnation was in this very fact that the eternal Son did thus identify himself with the son of Mary, gradually, surely, permanently, inextricably, as the life of his life, as an element or Moment or ground of his consciousness, not only without interfering with the normal development of Jesus, but being glorified by that very naturalness and in turn irradiating and glorifying it: and all this that he the Son might thus become the servant (slave, *δουλός*) of man and of his Father, and thus by giving himself, as he says, as a ransom for many win eternal salvation for the former and glory for the latter. That was Kenosis.

Therefore it is beside the point to say that the infinite could not voluntarily limit his knowledge. He never had to. But in choosing to thus become the Son of Man, the Son of God placed himself necessarily in human relations for a specific purpose, and the glory of his naturalness was that he used his divine

qualities and powers only for that specific purpose. As Son of Man he could not, as Son of God he would not, do otherwise. Not to know the time of his Second Coming was not a "forgetting," was not a "choosing not to know," was not a contradiction in deity, but was the working out of inevitable limitations of his incarnate life. But could not his Father have revealed the time to him? Yes, and there was sufficient intercommunication between Father and Son for all the ends of the latter's ministry as world Saviour, and that ministry abundantly showed that the Son did share the eternal light, love, power, knowledge, glory, of him whom we call the Everlasting Father—(when did he begin to be Father?) But there is a fittingness, beauty, and harmony in those relations which precluded arbitrariness in power or curiosity-satisfying in knowledge. Christ is a miracle but not a portent, for he has his ground in the Eternal Reason.

The objection is urged that Kenosis allies itself with naturalistic evolution in putting all the emphasis on the original cell, or impulse in the cell, determining as by a kind of mechanical certainty the person to be later developed from the cell, in this case the divine Christ because of exclusive supernatural character of the birth; whereas author thinks the true view is that whatever supernaturalism there was or was not in the birth of Christ there must be divine activity all along the way, especially in his ministry. But did Paul in stating Kenosis (Phil. 2) say anything about birth? He was thinking of Christ's whole state of humiliation. Has any Christian ever been so wild-eyed as to stake everything on conception and birth, place no importance on the thousand influences which played on Jesus before and after he was born, and especially on that Spirit which was not given by measure to him? Please quote one Christian writer who has done this, who explains Christ "exclusively by the conditions of his physical origin?" So far as I know, the most that even the strictest "orthodox" writer would say is that assuming that Christ was the Son of God, existing in and with God as Logos and Son before his incarnation (Kenosis), as the Bible does assume, it is not only fitting and beautiful that his earthly origin should also be from above, his humanity being guaranteed by the mother, but it is religiously and philosophically inevitable that that origin should be from above (the so-called Virgin

Birth); and so far from denying, on the contrary affirming, that along with that divine impulse at the historic beginning there were and must be innumerable other influences playing on the earthly manifestation of the Son, pre-natal, child, lad, young man, man,—many of these influences physical and human, others human-divine, others divine. Who "confines incarnation to any one event?"

But remember this, the chief proof of Kenosis or incarnation is the many facts which prove that our Lord's life, consciousness, testimony, works, and the historic influences and results of all these, rest back upon a divine-human Person, the ground of whose being went back not to an intrigue of a Galilean carpenter with an otherwise pious maid, but into the bosom of the eternal God. Our N. T. sources prove this, history proves it so far as it can prove any fact partly human, partly divine. You can deny this by two ways: first by a false philosophy; second by a literary criticism, itself resting not on literary causes but on antisupernaturalistic presuppositions, which eviscerates the N. T. of its content, and makes it as worthless historically as impotent religiously.

Author is doubtful whether Luke intended to teach miraculous birth of Christ. He thinks certain alleged facts introduce ambiguity into Luke's narrative. What are they? (a) That in 1:31, 35 the conception is still future. Of course it is future. The angel is announcing it as future. Whoever dreamt of anything different? (b) That since an interval is to elapse between announcement and conception Joseph in that interval might have begotten Jesus. There are two facts against this interesting supposition of author. First, Mary was only betrothed (verse 27) to Joseph, and though betrothal made her legally his in an anticipatory sense, she was not at all his in the sense of marital rights, and violation of those rights by the future husband or wife was adultery. The second fact against Joseph begetting a child in the interval is the declaration of the angel to Mary's natural query as to how she was to bear the Messiah when she was a virgin (and must so remain till regular marriage) to the effect the "power of the Most High shall overshadow thee" and that therefore the child shall be called "the Son of God" (verse 35). Matthew himself could not and did not express the miraculous birth more plainly. And so Mary understood it, and was

content. (c) Luke speaks of "his parents," "his father," etc. But Luke knew that for the protection of both Mary and the babe Joseph must be willing to assume full legal rights as husband and father of his wife's children. This Joseph was great enough to do, and Luke gave him his legal title. The relation of this devout and high minded carpenter was far from being "wholly external" in fact or in Luke's mind, and there is nothing "inconsistent" in Luke's narrative. It is not only consistent historically, but as a narrative it is unsurpassed, and in poetic movement and spiritual splendor its beauty is still with us. So far as I know, author is the first writer to suggest that Luke leaves the matter of supernatural birth doubtful. (d) Luke "is writing without the question of the method of the conception ever having occurred to him" (p. 304). Has author weighed his words? Was Luke so innocent? Did he not know the meaning of words? When he quoted Mary's assertion of virginity in our verse 34, and heard the Miraculous Birth announced in our verse 35, was he so simple that the method of conception never occurred to him, to him the physician? Author says that Luke "fails to confirm the Matthew presentation," that Luke "may be taking it for granted that Jesus' life began in the usual way," and that he "must have regarded the method of conception as only of incidental importance." I challenge any man to show how Luke could have declared the miraculous birth more plainly and yet more finely—consistent with the wonderful literary beauty of Luke's first chapter—than he does in verses 34 and 35. You may or may not believe in the Birth, or you may hold the matter at a distance as something that does not concern you, but there are only two ways by which you can get rid of Luke's testimony to it, and these are the two ways in which it has been gotten rid of: that is, either claim with rationalists that verses 34 and 35 are interpolations, or that the whole chapter and much else in the Gospels is legend, with extreme rationalists.

Luke is praised and Matthew is dispraised because one gives much in favor of Mary's splendid equipment to bear the Messiah and the other does not. That's like praising Hume for giving much on England's wars and dispraising Green for giving little, or Matthew for giving the Sermon on the Mount and condemning Mark for not giving

it. Each wrote with his own intention, from his own point of view. The only pertinent question is, Do Matthew and Luke contradict, or rather supplement, each other?

Because Luke is not decisive (as is alleged) in favor of miraculous birth (though he could hardly be more decisive) it is said he favors the "modern situation" which does not make that Birth very important as a religious test. It is a commonplace with many to allege silence of Mark and other N. T. writers as proving non-importance of the facts of Christ's origin. But silence is significant only when it betrays. In all your life you have never had to defend or even mention your father's honor or your mother's good name. Should I say then that you consider these of no vital consequence? But if I attack them and you are silent, that means either a confession or that I am not worth notice. Circumstances of birth are not common talk. Silence of a biography might mean ignorance or an intent in writing where mention is irrelevant.

It is said that our Lord's "experience was controlled by the same laws that control our own." True and not true. Of course Jesus was a real man, and it goes without saying that much of his experience was under the same laws as ours. But was *all* his experience thus controlled? Were the mighty deeds he did in his own name an experience similar to ours? Was the absolute fullness of his knowledge of the Father's similar to ours, controlled by our laws? His Gethsemane experience? Cross? Resurrection? And so forth. Yes. Christ had all the normal human experiences (sin excepted), but have we a plummet deep enough to sound all that went on in that consciousness where the eternal Father saw himself in his eternal Son?

What then is author's thought of Christ? If I understand, it is this. God (that is, the Father; God does not exist from eternity as Trinity, Father, Son and Spirit, except figuratively or symbolically) has from eternity an element in his nature which seeks expression, an impulse to go out to some other. This impulse or quality is the Word or Son, and it shows itself in creating the universe, then man, finally the Man. This Son or Man did not preexist with the Father as the Son in the Christian Trinity, but in God's thought. Finally there was a woman so wonderfully endowed that she could bring forth a child, who thus starting well could achieve

and did achieve perfect moral oneness with God, and thus became the Man, through whom God could perfectly reveal his character of love, and who (the Man) would finally lay down his life in obedience to this principle, and thus show how deeply God loved man. When man saw how much God loved him as thus revealed in this wonderful life and death, he would leave his sins, and the Man would thus be a Saviour. But this Saviour, as he thus indirectly becomes, is a man only, a creation of God like all men. But through his unique maternal endowment he was able to think God's thoughts and do God's will more perfectly than any other, and no one else will ever be able to think and do so perfectly. When God at last found such a man, he was content. He looked no farther. He let this man achieve salvation, that is, let him show the world what a gracious God there was, of which fact when men were assured, they would leave their sins and be good. In this sense, as a genius who was able thus to grasp the secret of God and reveal it to the world Christ was the eternal Christ, the eternal Logos, the eternal Son (not really eternal, but only in God is thought or purpose eternal), this Son or Logos not being a subsistence or Person or substantial element in God, but the impulse in God's nature to impart, to create, to save, to love. We do not believe in Christ, therefore, for salvation, but we believe in the "reality and truth" in God which Jesus Christ stood for. If you say this is no real incarnation, it is replied that creation itself is incarnation, because incarnation is simply indwelling, and "what God makes [the world, especially this splendid man] he thereby indwells." God recognizes himself in this son or man, because the latter proved himself so holy, good, etc., and thus "as a part of God's own creation" this person is Immanuel, "God with us." "If any life bespeaks the divine creativity, then the One true life bespeaks it too, only more fully." All human life has its basis in the divine nature, the being of Jesus has that same basis. That basis for any man and for Jesus Christ is what fourth Gospel calls the Logos, and it is simply the impulse of God to go forth. Therefore all men are in essence as divine as the Son, but not in the same measure, because the created Christ or Son was able by his fine endowment, to show forth God better. God therefore was able at last to find a man in whom "he saw what he him-

self would choose to be and to do in the same circumstances." The qualities that were incomplete say in Isaiah God found complete in Jesus, and since all good is divine, Jesus proved himself divine, this "achievement takes on a universal character." Because goodness is there in such perfection "deity is there and humanity is there, and who shall say which is which?" When Christ says, "Before Abraham was I am" he does not mean that he existed in eternity, but that the qualities he had, which qualities in their abundant measure were in a real sense God dwelling in him, existed in God in eternity. That is the only sense in which Jesus Christ preexisted. "He is eternal, because there never was a time in the past and there never will be a time in the future when God was or will be any other than as he appeared in him." In this sense only Christ is the same yesterday, today and forever. And since God is always giving or sacrificing, when Jesus went to death "in obedience to his vocation" (say like Huss) that was God going also, that is, both sacrificing, God and man. Though Jesus himself is created and temporal like every other man, "what we see in Jesus," that is, these divine qualities, spirit, etc., is "something uncreated and eternal." That only we worship, and since he thus revealed God, and God was thus in him, we can even call him or at least exclaim, My Lord and my God. I might say that author has in many sentences given his own views as though different from those of the "traditional Christology." But some of these views are perfectly at home in many evangelical or orthodox writers, including some opinions which he places in italics, as especially his own departures. As I said, the book would have been more valuable if it had rested on an adequate knowledge of the history of Christian doctrine.

Whether the above view of our Lord satisfies our N. T. sources, is built on a natural, fair scientific exegesis of them, and whether it satisfies Christian experience and history, cannot be answered in this number.

Madison, New Jersey.

What we call luck,
Is simply pluck,
And doing things over and over;
Courage and will,
Perseverance and skill
Are the four leaves of luck's clover.

Let us be Reasonable.

BY THE REVEREND J. W. CAIN

THE easy way in which some writers are able to dispose of religious questions as scarcely worthy of consideration by modern men and women is somewhat amusing, as well as slightly vexatious, to persons who take the trouble to do a little thinking for themselves. Seeing that many whose words, written or spoken, show them to be of high intellectual powers still adhere to the Christian faith—are their views to be dismissed by mere assertions, unproven theories, a wave of the hand? Certainly the utterances of many who succeed in breaking into the magazines of the day indicate that they think these quite sufficient. Let us look at a few instances.

A sprightly writer in one of the leading magazines recently told how when he was traveling through Egypt "an intelligent gentleman" had shown him that the "finding of Moses, if it is anything more than a pretty fairy tale, was merely the old story of the unmarried mother and her child." Wherefore he did not care to visit the spot where Moses was said to have been found. But, supposing, as is not unreasonable, that unmarried mothers did dispose of their babies by putting them in baskets among the bulrushes; is that any proof at all that in a time of such distress as that of Moses's birth a good woman would not resort to the same means to save the life of her child? Would not this Egyptian practice, on the contrary, rather be confirmatory evidence of the truth of the story in Exodus? "An intelligent gentleman" declares otherwise, and so a Bible fact must be given up!

With equal ease the beautiful story of the virgin birth of our Lord as recorded by Luke is treated as unworthy of credence. It is only a rehash of the myths about the gods having intercourse with women and so producing the heroic characters of old. But why not consider these myths as token of man's intuitive sense of nearness to God and of the certainty that deliverance would come to him from God? Years ago I was sleeping in a farmhouse near where a small creek crossed the road. I was awakened in the night by a great outcry. A man driving a mule team was calling for help. One of his mules saw in the stream the reflection of the moon, which was then at the full, and refused to risk taking a plunge to that shining orb by venturing into the creek. What a time they did have getting the "critter" across! Now any

creature of brains should have known that there was no moon where the mule supposed it to be, but does this prove there is no moon at all? Persons of only ordinary intelligence, like most of us, fancy that the reflection actually proved the opposite. Are we mistaken?

Again take this proposition: It is a manifestation of supreme egotism on the part of man to suppose that the great Being, if there be such a Being, who created, upholds and controls this vast universe would give any consideration to such insignificant creatures as are we who inhabit this small planet a mere mote in a sunbeam compared with the universe. Well, it does seem wonderful; and perhaps we who think the infinite God does care for us are egotistical. But this argument recalls a paragraph you had to translate in your "First Lessons in Greek." It was as follows: "An idiot, whose little child had died, apologized at the funeral for bringing so small a body before so large a company." Jesus cried out at one time: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!" He seemed to care. And He taught that God is a heavenly Father and truly cares for man. Read the sermon on the mount. It strikes some people as one strong proof of the greatness of God that while directing the affairs of the universe he can at the same time give needed attention to that creature who bears His image. The thought may amaze us, as it did the Psalmist; but does it not ennoble God as well as exalt man?

Now appears on the scene another unbeliever, who declares in his contribution to the world's enlightenment that religion is a right good thing, in that it serves as an opiate for the superstitious fears of persons who still linger under the shadows of priestly domination, persons of insufficient courage or intellectual strength to assert their independence. Well! well! "Priestly domination!" Where in all Protestantism can it be found? Christianity an opiate! So it was an opiate that transformed Saul the persecutor into Paul the apostle and sent him through all the countries about the Mediterranean preaching the gospel of the crucified and risen Son of God! It was an opiate that enabled him to endure the hardest trials and bitterest persecutions and at last gladly to die as a witness of the truth of Christ! And it was an opiate that nerved the heroic Martin Luther for the tremendous fight in which he engaged! The Reformation was wrought out by men under the influence of an opiate! John

Wesley, too, was affected by an opiate! It was an opiate which energized him for the long years of labor and service, a part of the fruit of which was the saving of England from the fearful experiences of the French Revolution. What a peculiar opiate that so energizes men!

As one reads such unthinking dogmatism he is moved to wonder whether those who utter such things really take seriously their own words? Do they not know what ignorance they manifest concerning New Testament teachings? How large is the element of fear in the ministry of Jesus? It is there to some extent, to be sure, but in how large a degree? Hear Him: "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God sent not the Son into the world to judge the world; but that the world should be saved through him." "I came that they may have life, and may have it abundantly." "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom

for many." Are such words spoken to beget fear in the hearts of hearers? Are they not calculated to awaken love, love that is stronger than fear? Listen to John: "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. We love, because he first loved us." And hear Paul's explanation of his devotion and tireless service: "It is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me: and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself up for me." Christianity an opiate? Would it not be nearer the truth to call it a stimulant? But far better is Christ's own characterization: "The water that I shall give him shall become in him a well of water springing up unto eternal life." Recognize the truth, O philosophical friend, and find your place with those who accept the invitation: "He that is athirst, let him come: he that will, let him take the water of life freely."

Deland, Florida.

For Your Scrap Book

REVEREND A. WALLACE COPPER, B.A.

Margaret Ethel MacDonald*

THE ancestors of Margaret MacDonald can be traced back to 1597, for their names are recorded on the parish register at Kelso. Her mother was the daughter of a United Presbyterian minister. Her father Dr. Gladstone lived at a time when a sprightly science claimed to have subdued all knowledge and all faith. He was no timorous explorer, no weak-kneed apologist. He embraced the science of his day and at the same time clung tenaciously and proudly to his Christian belief. Margaret's mother had come from fine people. Her grandfather had been a member of the faculty of the University of Glasgow. She too had a good mind. In her blood mingled the hard imaginative worldliness of the Ulster peasant, hard practical and yet stern when moved by rectitude. Her mind was clear and capable of expression.

On July 31, 1868, she wrote after her visit to Pevensey Castle, "It was beautiful to look

from its rugged outline to the distant hills beyond in the dreamy summer light, and through its broken arches on the wide blue sea, and solemn to think of the generations that have lived and passed away since this castle was new and entire in its grim strength with no rich ivy clothing its walls. And yet the same hill and the sea! I kneeled down in a lonely shady place and prayed and committed my whole life to Him who is the same yesterday, today, and forever."

Margaret Ethel Gladstone was born July 20, 1870. A little tearful service was performed upon her a few days later. By the 16th of the following month her mother knew that life was rapidly passing. Some one said to her, "Who shall have charge of the child?" The answer came back, "God."

In her young life Margaret was interested in social work. She spent her evenings at the Boys' Club in Kensington and helped them with handwork and played games with them. She knew how to make every person, boy, girl, man and woman very much at home. She could ease the minds of her com-

* Margaret Ethel MacDonald by J. Ramsay MacDonald.

pany. It is no wonder she possessed the mind of the people, for she was concerned about the welfare of those who win their bread by the sweat of their brow. Her interests involved her in the work of the "Women's Industrial Council," "The National Union of Women Workers," and many other philanthropic and industrial clubs. She had the faculty of widening the horizon of those she met.

Later in life when her little David died she wrote to a friend and explained that she used to say "Good Morning" and "Good Night" to him. Somehow, to have a little fellow beyond the veil brought her comfort. She never felt far away from him.

She traveled and that augmented her versatility. She went to India with her husband, Ramsay MacDonald. Without hesitation she could recall the most unfamiliar titles of the Hindus. In 1888 she was in France and the Riviera and Italy as far as Pisa. That autumn found her in Sweden and Denmark. The year before she died Ramsay MacDonald went over this same territory with her and in her diary she wrote, "We have a nice balcony in Copenhagen and often were out in it watching the sunset skies. There was also a full moon."

Margaret MacDonald was a woman of religious convictions. She did not believe true happiness could be found passing through the world as easily as possible. One must make the distinction between right and wrong. Religion was a dramatic reality. She taught a class of boys in the Sunday school.

Her home life was beautiful. Mr. MacDonald writes, "Every Sunday when we returned from the country, she liked to sing hymns with her children. She always chose amongst others the hymn which we sang at Golders Green,

Calmly, calmly, lay her down,
She hath fought a noble fight,
She hath battled for the right,
She hath won the unfading crown.

It was her idea that we should be happy in the shadows."

How true that was of her. The faith she possessed stood the test until the end. When she knew she was close to the opening gates of death, Ramsay MacDonald asked her if she desired to see any one who would speak to her of what was to come. She who had followed the wish of her mother that she should go through life making laughter, replied, "That would be but a waste of time.

I have always been ready. Let us praise God for what has been." She was convinced that life and time were not the sum and substance of experience and went away as though she was starting upon a journey which, beginning in darkness would proceed through light. As the flickering light of life was going out she said to her lover, "I will hold your hand until those who have gone before greet me." And so she slipped away holding his hand.

One cannot read her life without feeling that in it she was a girl who was finding the world a delightful place full of intense interest and in whom the world was finding an attractively strange mingling of childlike innocence and mature common sense. Wherever she went she brought all the sunshine of the world and all its seriousness with her.

She did not want marriage to make a difference in her home. Her home was to be open. When she died it was said in some newspaper that she founded a political salon. That is not what she did at all. She opened her home to her friends. She said, "It is a great mistake to arrange your life so that one set of people should always see you on committees and another always see you wasting your time. If I can work one day and make merry the next so can my friends."

The stranger was welcome within her gates. Once every three weeks the men and women who were busy in the service of Labor and Socialism crowded into their rooms. The stranger from the ends of the earth, black, yellow or white came as a guest. Amidst her guests she moved chatting and cheering. Her wonderful memory for names and faces and vigilant sympathy made her a perfect hostess for a great crowd.

One who came as a stranger wrote from British Columbia. "It is difficult to believe that when I return again to England and mount your stairs, I shall not see that happy young woman who received me as though I had been an old friend. I was lonely till that night and was beginning to hate England. Nobody was interested in me. But five minutes in your house were enough to banish my bad mood. It was all the more wonderful because I was nobody in particular, and she took as much interest in me as though I was one of the important men I met that night. The news of her death was cabled here, and when I saw it in the newspapers I felt sick at heart and tears came to my eyes."

One settlement worker wrote to her, "You certainly have a pleasant way of living." She once said that she had no time for the class from which she came. It wasted its time prizing tinsel and trash.

There was no lack of friends. They came at all hours and on all missions; the poor refugee, the stricken mother, the crippled wage earner, the stranger from distant places, the political committee, the young person at the gateway of the world, the personal friend. They all came and were treated alike. This was the way her diary read: "Yesterday G. our special Indian official friend turned up and we invited him to lunch at the house today. This afternoon Vida Goldstein of Australia came in and found the sewing party in full swing. This morning an Indian doctor came. Yesterday four strangers met on the doorstep, none of them knowing each other." She certainly had a pleasant way of living.

At an afternoon tea she said to a woman who was orating about parents' rights, "Don't you think that our children have some rights against us? For instance, don't you think they have a right to be protected against the silly prejudices of their parents—mine and yours both?"

Once after a long industrial investigation and being stirred with what she saw she said, "When the wages board will have given its last decision, we will go upon the housetops shouting with Marx, 'Workers of the world unite, You have nothing to lose but your chains.'

There was a rugged democratic texture in her friendship which gave it peculiar strength. She did not use any cheap art to win friends. It was sincerity she looked for, and after her death one of her friends said, "She believed in us all, and so she could make diamonds out of dust."

Margaret MacDonald had within her being a Holy of Holies where she sat alone and where the presence of her dearest was forbidden. In the long dark night of the Lossiemouth late autumn and winter, with the moan of the sea passing over the land like the cry of toiling creation, the call of the night birds flying overhead, and the mass of the stars shining above her, she would retire within herself and go out silently to the shore in quest of something which haunts life like a dim vision of a strange beauty or a confused echo of a far away melody.

Ramsay MacDonald writes, "She lived

most truly when the day's work was done, when the world was shut out and the lamps were lit and when I was home. She loved the long dark nights, and sat, before the lamps were lit, watching the shadow's movements on the walls of the room made by the lights of the fields below, and the black sky above with the glare from the streets reflected on the clouds. She liked to be silent, for it was then she opened up her mind to the spirit of life."

With vigor she opposed the South African War. Delegates from South Africa were entertained in her home. She gave her rooms to their meetings. "If the mob throw stones up to our windows," she said, "their muscles will have to be as well developed as their ignorance which is impossible."

After peace had been declared she went to Capetown; tramped over the battlefields south of Kimberley and in Natal. The trenches were still open, every stone was spattered over by bullets, the debris of the game of murder lay everywhere. She visited those corners full of white sparkling gravestones marking where little children lay. She went into the shanties where she heard bitter women tell their tale of hatred.

Just when over the threshold of forty, just when effort is the most vigorous, just when she is entering upon her full possessions of influence and power—death comes and bears her to the grave.

How frequently have we seen children playing in the summertime and in the midst of play the good mother comes and gathers them up in her arms. They plead that they may finish their laughter, end their games but their hour of rest has come. So it was with Margaret MacDonald. She was called to sleep while it was day, before the chilly shadows of night came to enfold her.

They say that away in some hidden cavern protected by enchantment the good knights of King Arthur lie asleep in their mail, their weapons by their sides and their horses saddled in their stalls. Nearby lies a sword which some chosen one is to draw when the time is fulfilled and a bugle which he is to blow. Then the enchantment will be broken and they will ride to establish justice and blessedness in the world.

Surely to that exclusive cavern a few others have been borne who have ears for the trumpet, and if not arms for the sword, they have a sustaining blessing for those who wield it. In my imagination, she is one.

Young People's Department

REVEREND HAROLD JOHN OCKENGA, B.A.

Topic for December 13, 1931 The Witness of a Transformed Life

Scripture: Ye are our epistle written in our hearts, known and read of all men.—2 Cor. 3:2. God hath not left Himself without a witness—Acts 14:17.

In an age of indecision upon religious matters, the value of a witness is stupendous. A witness is one who knows or who possesses the evidence of a fact. Jesus said, "We know what we have seen and we testify what we believe." He could say, "I am a witness because I know." To complete His special witness He called out Apostles, whom He inspired to receive His Word. As the apostolate ceased, the Bible was left among us as a great witness of the recorded dealings of God with man. What then, might be asked, is the great need for witnesses to day since we still have the Bible? The need is great because the Bible is no longer read by the unbeliever, but his glance is constantly on the living witness or the Christian. It is even more necessary since the history of the Church has been discolored.

1. The Church is The Witness

(A group of people that have been changed.)

The Church comes from the word *ekklesia* which means a group of called-out people. We have become so associated with the term Church as meaning a building that we have forgotten that the true Church consists of a group of people, changed and transformed by the power of God. We have come to hallow beautiful buildings with stained glass windows, carved chancel rails, and vested choirs, and yet such an edifice is no more sacred than the most humble four walls that enclose a group of worshipping Christians. The Church exists where its members are. These saved people are different from the world.

This difference was illustrated by the ancient Hebrew nation which was distinct from all of its neighbors. It was set aside for a holy purpose. There was a difference in its laws, in its customs, and in its practices. A like difference was drawn between the disciples and nonbelievers. The disciples did not count their lives dear unto themselves. They refused to worship the common ideas, and their faith was all the world to them. There has been a difference between Christians and non-Christians ever since, and there should be a difference between believers and non-believers today. How contrary to the practices of the present day Christians. Being found in questionable theatres, haunts of pleasure, and company, they have completely lost their witness unto the Divine Power. Not so with the life of Stephen, who because of his adherence to the will and faith of God, died, but with his face witnessing as the face of an angel.

This group that forms the Church is a proof of

the Resurrection of Jesus. Peter, in preaching at Pentecost, argued that the disciples gave evidence that Christ had risen from the dead because they were living resurrected lives. They had been changed from fearful, dependent individuals, to fearless, ingenious commanders of multitudes. This change in the life of the disciples from a defeated, discouraged, hopeless group of men to a powerful transforming body, able to turn the then-known world upside down is irrefutable as the psychological argument for the Resurrection.

Within this group of changed people there is and should be a marvelous fellowship existing. Sometimes this is hindered by the presence of a number of nominal Christians who stifle the liberty of the children of God. This fellowship is what we would expect. As soon as one is changed, his desires, appetites, and inclinations are different. This is bound to exclude him from non-Christian fellowship. He becomes uncomfortable there, and non-Christians are not comfortable with him around. He disturbs their consciences by his life. The old adage of "birds of a feather flock together" is true. Yes, to be changed places a bond between yourself and every other changed person that cannot be broken. That is why we sing:

"Blest be the tie that binds
Our hearts in Christian love,
The fellowship of kindred minds,
Is like to that above."

2. The Church Should Change Lives

Paul, in writing to the Corinthians, said, "Ye are our epistle written in our hearts, known and read of all men." Some years before, on his first missionary journey, in about 53 A.D., Paul spent six months at Corinth. Famed as a city of harlots, depraved sailors, heathen cults, and insidious practices, Corinth had become the birthplace of a number of Christians who witnessed to the saving power of Christ. Now, six years later, while at Ephesus, Paul is penning what is called his second epistle to the Corinthian Church of which he was the spiritual father. In the meantime, some false apostles had come with letters of commendation and had upset the equilibrium of the Corinthian Church. A hasty visit by the apostle followed, during which he was opposed by a group within the church and his authority questioned. After his departure, he wrote another now lost epistle to the Corinthian Church, calling them to account for their sin. At this epistle they evidently repented of their un-Christian attitude, and again accepted Paul. Now, in writing his third message to them he calls to mind that he need have no letter of commendation, for the Corinthians themselves were his epistle written on his heart. He did not have to carry an epistle in his hand, he had one in his heart.

The Church, with the Gospel, has always changed lives. We think of the change wrought in the life of St. Augustine, when he was turned by the power of God and the prayers of a saintly mother from

profligacy to saint-hood. It changed Jerry McAuley from a river thief to a missionary. It changed Wesley from a sedate and pious scholar to a zealous evangelist. It changed the English society of the eighteenth century from half-brutalized savagery to respectable living. And each one of us who is a Christian today knows that it has changed our lives by its power. While riding along with a thumper on my vacation, I spent two hours telling him of the power of the Gospel to change a life. He was born in Russia, had worked hard, was well educated, but seemingly had received no breaks in life. Finally, with a throb in his voice that revealed the sadness of forty odd lonely years, he said, "I wish I could believe what you tell is true." And when we separated, there was a smile upon his lips and tears in his eyes as he thought of what might have been and what might yet be in his own life. Yes, the Church, a group of changed people, changes others.

3. The Church is a Group of People that are Changed by and that Change Others through the Transforming Power of Christ.

In this chapter, Paul tells us of the glory that lighted up the face of Moses, when he communed with God upon the Mount. It was necessary for him to veil his face because of its brightness. When he talked to the people he removed the veil and he reflected the glory of the image of God on his countenance, and the people feared to come near him. But as he conversed with them, the glory faded till he lowered the veil and went again to commune with God.

Likewise, Paul says, "We all with open faces, beholding as in a glass, the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord." Moses was an important witness unto God to the people because he had the stamp of God's image upon him. Today, with unveiled face, we Christians have the privilege of beholding in the glass, that is, the Word of God, the image of Jesus Christ. And in the proportion that we study that Word, and imbibe His redeeming Gospel, the Spirit of God will transform us from one step of glory unto the next as we, too, shall begin to bear His image.

Now the blood of Christ cleanses our hearts, the Spirit of Christ illuminates our minds, and some day the coming of Christ shall change our bodies into His likeness. No wonder John says, "Now are we the sons of God, but it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that we shall be like Him for we shall see Him as He is."

Conclusion

But, alas, even as some saw no further than the letter of the law when Moses gave it, and pierced not through to the end of the law which would be abolished, and were as those who had veils over their faces, even so there are those today who cannot see beyond the record of God's Acts in the Scripture to the spiritual realities and eternal truths recorded in the Bible. The secrets of God's grace are hidden from them, and they experience no transforming processes in their soul, because the initial experience of the New Birth has never been theirs. Every witness who is a true one will himself possess the witness of the spirit in his heart, for Paul says that the Spirit beareth witness with our spirit that we are the Children of God, and we have

received not the spirit of bondage to fear but the spirit of adoption into the fellowship of the family of God.

Questions

1. Where in the Bible is recorded the image of Christ? What are we to study to know it? Who is to be our teacher? Why should a Christian study the Bible?

2. Does your society really change the lives of those it touches? Do you entertain or do you fulfill the function of a Christian group? What definite things could you do to change a person?

3. Do you think most professing Christians are changed people? Are they different from the world? What is the obligation of the Christian in this matter?

Topic for December 20, 1931

A Christian Christmas

ROBERT S. MARSDEN

*Scripture (For the Leader): Matthew Ch. 1,2;
Luke Ch.1,2.*

Scripture (For the Meeting): Luke 1:67-80.

Introduction

THE topic for this Christmas Sunday, "A Christian Christmas," seems rather unusual, for it implies that every Christmas is not Christian. When we think of Christmas our minds immediately run to Christmas Cards, Christmas Trees, Christmas Gifts, Christmas Dinners—all these things are good, for Christmas should be the time of joy for Christians. Our topic compels us, however, to ask whether these things are the central things of Christmas. Are these the things that make for a Christian Christmas? Obviously none of these is essential to Christmas, and none of these makes Christmas truly Christian. For a Christmas to be Christian there must be something besides those things mentioned—and that something must be an emphasis upon Jesus Christ whose birth we celebrate at Christmas. That emphasis should not be simply added to the other things which we enjoy, but it should be the central thought of Christmas to which the enjoyment of all the other good things of the season is subsidiary. A Christmas is Christian in proportion as Christ is exalted in the celebration of it.

In the passage read as our Scripture Lesson we have a scene prior to the first Christmas Day, just as our service tonight is prior to Christmas day. Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, is filled with the Holy Spirit, and is speaking wonderful things about the Christ who is to be born. Does it not seem logical that if our Christmas is to be Christian our thoughts should be centered upon the same things that filled the mind of this holy man, filled with the Holy Spirit, prior to the first Christmas? Let us let the Holy Spirit of God Himself teach us what are the important things to be emphasized in connection with the birth of Jesus which we shall commemorate on Christmas day. The list of things to emphasize is not, of course, absolutely complete, for there are many things of which Zachariah has not spoken. He says nothing of the Virgin Birth, for instance, of which he knew and to which he was looking forward. But if we put our emphasis upon the things which the Holy Spirit puts in the mouth of Zachariah we will not be far wrong in making our Christmas

a Christian Christmas. The emphasis in this short prophecy, the first nine verses of which refer to the Christ, and the last three to John the Baptist in his relation to Christ, is on the following.

1. Blessing to God

The prophecy opens with praise to God. The immediate emphasis is on the grace of God in sending Christ. Zachariah realizes that it is by the unmerited favor that God showers upon His people, that Christ is to be sent. He realizes that the Jewish people were in rebellion against Jehovah, but in spite of their rebellion that God was sending a Saviour to them. He realizes that God was sending this great Gift even while they were yet his enemies. A Christian Christmas will have much emphasis placed upon the grace of God in giving Christ.

2. Salvation from Sin

Immediately Zachariah speaks of the saving work of Christ. It is very interesting that in the midst of the birth narrative of Jesus that the work which Jesus was to accomplish by His death is given prominence. Zachariah saw that Jesus came not primarily to be something, nor to say something, but to do something, and he knew that the thing He was to do was to bring salvation. Zachariah sees that there is a two-fold salvation which He was to bring—salvation from our enemies and from the wiles of the Devil in the present time (v. 71) and salvation from the wrath of God against sin by the remission of sins (v. 77). Much emphasis will be placed upon the necessity of accepting Christ as Saviour on a Christian Christmas.

3. The Prophecies Concerning Christ

And then Zachariah goes back to the Old Testament to account for the work which Christ was to do. He realizes that the Old Testament is the Word of God and that none can understand the work of Christ without knowing something of the Old Testament prophecies concerning him.

He thus first considers Christ as the Son of David, and the fulfillment of the promise made to David that his house would reign eternally over Israel. (2 Samuel 7:12ff.) In Christ was seen the fulfillment of this prophecy, for Christ was a direct descendant of David. Christ was thus truly a king, but what faith was required on the part of Zachariah to confess that He was the fulfillment of that wonderful prophecy, when Zachariah knew of how humble parentage He was to be born! Christ is now king in the hearts of his followers who look forward to the time when he shall be king over all the earth. A Christian Christmas will give place to emphasis upon making Christ the ruler in the lives of those whom he has chosen to serve him.

Next Zachariah considers Christ as the fulfillment of the covenant of God with Abraham, the covenant that God would bless Abraham's seed and make it as the stars of the heavens and as the sands upon the sea-shore in number, and that all the nations will be blessed in that seed. (Gen. 17:1ff.). Zachariah now sees that the Seed of Abraham is Christ; that those who are the followers of Christ are the true spiritual seed of Abraham to whom the promise is to be fulfilled. He knew that God was faithful in keeping his promises and his covenants, and that what He covenanted to do He would surely fulfill. On a Christian Christmas there will be rejoicing that God is faithful in all his promises, and that He will surely bring to pass that which he promises.

4. Service to God

The prophecy then passes over to the thought of service which will follow the deliverance. When the Jews were in captivity they could not please God with their service, and neither can we please him when we are bound in sin. But once we have received the deliverance which came with Christ, then we too will want to "serve him without fear" (Vs. 74,75). On a Christian Christmas there will be much thought of the gifts of holy lives which we will bring to God in thanksgiving for his great gift of Jesus Christ, who was born the first Christmas day.

Questions

What is meant by grace? Did God send Christ to save the Jewish people because they deserved to be saved?

What is the primary reason why God sent Christ to earth?

Why did Christ have to be the Son of David? Is Christ the ruler of this world now? If he is not, who is?

What do you mean by a covenant?

Can one who is not a Christian serve God acceptably?

Does one who is not a Christian receive rewards for his service?

Topic for December 27, 1931

Confess Your Faults

Scripture: Confess your faults one to another, and pray for one another, that ye may be healed.—James 5:16; Daniel Ch. 9; Leviticus Ch. 16; II Samuel Ch. 12.

HERE can be no living and transforming regeneration of the soul without a complete and unequivocating confession. In the early church the preaching of the sons of thunder was always accompanied by a confession of sin. All Judea and Jerusalem went out unto John the Baptist and were baptized by him in the Jordan River confessing their sins. And when Paul performed his mighty works in Ephesus many that believed came and confessed showing their deeds. The next step after confession is always restitution, but without confession both of membership in sinful society and personal sin there is no step toward God.

What the early Hebrew ritual taught in relation to confession in anticipating Christianity, (read Lev.16), and what modern psychology teaches in substitution for Christianity the Scripture presents in its true meaning. This teaching of confession has at least four distinct meanings to which we shall now give attention.

1. Confession of Doctrine in the Early Church

The first great confession of the early church was made by Peter upon the Mount near Baneus at Philippi of Caesarea. Jesus had asked, "Whom do men say that I the Son of Man am?"

"Thou," said Peter, "art Christ, the Son of the living God." A lightning like thrill passed through that apostolic group upon that statement, for it was the first concentrated apprehension of the nature and purpose of Christ. Every time since that moment that an individual has fully realized the meaning of that confession a like thrill has vibrated

through his being, he has seen the purpose of the universe, and has realized that he is a citizen of the Kingdom of God. Either this has happened or the emotion has been one of terror as he realizes the meaning of rejecting such a claim.

To this confession was soon added the Trinitarian baptismal formula but even this was constructed about the nature of Christ. Jesus himself had said, "Go ye into all the world and teach unto all nations whatsoever I have said unto you, baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." The early church immediately formed this into its confession of faith. Out of this gradually grew the so called Apostles' Creed, which also is Trinitarian in structure but gives the confession of Christ the central and largest place, though not traceable in its present shape above the fourth century, and found in the second and third, in different longer or shorter forms, it is in structure altogether apostolic, and exhibits an incomparable summary of the leading facts in the revelation of the Triune God from the creation of the world to the resurrection of the body. The Apostle's Creed is the result of the Spirit's guidance of His Church through centuries of controversy and heathen attack against the great doctrines presented or sanctioned by Christ himself.

However, a doctrinal confession about Christ and God is not sufficient. He, himself says that we must witness a personal confession before men as to His saving power. He said, "Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father who is in heaven." This public confession includes a number of ways of witnessing. One is the partaking of the holy communion in which we celebrate the death and resurrection of Christ in atonement for our sin. Another is a constant attendance on the means of worship whereby non-Christians are cognizant of the fact that we worship Jesus Christ in His church. Another way of witnessing is the giving of our money for the propagation of fundamental and evangelical Christianity. But the most potent method of witnessing is a personal testimony to the saving power in your life of the Lord Jesus. "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord and shall believe in thy heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness but with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." By word of mouth Christ wants us to publish the glad tidings of salvation. The gospel does not mean a life, it means good news. That good news consists of a story of a ransom from sin. It must be told with the personal pronoun by a witness who knows that he has been redeemed.

2. Confession of Sin

Another essential of confession is its relationship to sin. "If ye confess your sins, He is faithful and just to forgive you your sins and to cleanse you from all unrighteousness." A monument of confession of sin is the fifty-first psalm, corresponding to which the twelfth chapter of Second Samuel was written. David had sinned a heinous sin. And yet in his self will he had covered it thinking that no one would know, but his peace of mind and tranquillity of life were gone. God was no longer real to him. Then in the midst of his contemplation broke the thundering words upon him of the prophet Nathan, "Thou art the man." Realizing

the depth of his fall he made public confession unto God, crying for mercy. What heart throbs beat through that psalm. "Have mercy on me, oh God, according to thy loving kindness . . . blot out my transgressions . . . against thee have I sinned and done evil in thy sight . . . purge me with hyssop and I shall be clean, wash me and I shall be whiter than snow . . . create in me a clean heart, oh God . . . restore unto me the joy of Thy salvation." What David learned through the denunciation of the prophet Nathan we should learn at the gentle leading of the Holy Spirit, namely, that confession brings the soul to God, and brings God to the soul.

There is no character in the Old Testament that can compare with Daniel for holiness of purpose and purity of life. Living during the exile in Babylon his people had fallen away into the practices of the heathen Chaldeans. Upon himself Daniel took the responsibility for the sins of his people. He set his face to seek the Lord by prayer and supplication, with fasting, and with sackcloth and ashes. He says that he prayed unto God and made his confession, which was a confession of his sins of omission and commission and of the sins of his people Israel. In answer to this confession and prayer God sent to him the Angel Gabriel who revealed the purpose of God with His people throughout the ages, the coming of the Messiah, and the salvation of the Gentiles—a marvelous example of the correct method of approach to God, that is, through confession.

A more startling conversion is not to be found than that of Saint Augustine. Not until he was thirty-two years of age did he hear the voice of God speak to him in the garden of a villa not far from Milan. Later in life he wrote *The Confessions* which detail his career up to his forty-fourth year. Full of the ardor of his first love and the fire and unction of the Holy Spirit they are a sublime effusion in which Augustine confesses to God in view of his own and succeeding generation, the sins of his youth. Through this work subsequent readers have been drawn into the inner sanctum of this saint's experience, and through him into the very presence of God.

That no forgiveness is received without confession is true, but one must also be sure that confession is related to an atonement. The great atonement for our sins has been made through Jesus Christ. If we look back to His sacrifice as Daniel and Aaron and David looked forward to it our forgiveness is assured.

3. Confession of Wrongs

Jesus said, "If thou bring thy gift to the altar and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, then come and offer thy gift." The implication of this is that confession must not only be made unto God but must be made unto the one wronged. Let no confusion exist here, personal sin which has been between God and the soul alone need not be confessed to other men. Every individual Christian is his own high priest. He has no need for a priest to stand between him and God. Christ alone is that priest. And yet if sin has wronged our fellow beings or separated us from them it is necessary that it be confessed to that individual. When an Israelite confessed his sin he also brought a trespass offering to make his wrong right. If God has

placed His finger upon any wrong done to our neighbor or brother, first let us be reconciled to him and then come and present our lives to God, for as we forgive men their trespasses so will the heavenly Father forgive us our trespasses.

4. Confession of Faults

Most important of all for the tranquillity and health of the Christian life is the confession of our faults. Faults are sins for they separate us from one another and the word James uses really means sin, but I think is correctly translated faults as a distinguishing class of sins. They are the sins which exist in the closest relationships of life, those in family and friendship.

How different would be the condition of our homes if Christians would follow this enjoinder. Only this week a woman sat in my study telling me the story of a home fraught with difficulty and contention. Both members of the family profess to be Christians and yet both considered the other at fault. Peace and love had fled and resentment and wrath had occupied their places. Many are the homes in which this is the condition. It may have been envy, or selfishness, or distrust, but it has done its work effectively and well. Divorce, separation, and sorrow, stare such relationships in the face. The future promises to be more harrowing than the past.

Conclusion

That old adage says, "Honest confession is good for the soul." May the spirit of God apply its precept so that some soul may confess for the first time that he is a sinner, that he believes that Jesus Christ died for his sin, that he is willing to make wrongs right, and that even though he may be on the road to perfection he will confess and admit his faults to those who are most likely to be affected by them.

Books

1. "Dwarf's Blood"—Ethel Olivier.
2. "The Scarlet Letter"—Hawthorne.
3. "Book of Martyrs" (on Confessions)—Fox.
4. Any Church History on Confessors and Martyrs.

1. Hurst.

2. Phillip Schaff.

3. Zenos.

Questions

1. What effect does confession have on the soul? Do you believe the Romish confessional is a good thing?
2. Should we stress the confession of wrongs more?
3. Are the Confessions of the church good things? Can you have a Christ without a creed?

Topic for January 3, 1932

Restored Years, or Restitution

*Scripture: Joel Ch. 2; Luke 19:1-10; Acts 3:12-26.
Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor, and if I have taken anything from any man by false accusation I restore him fourfold.*

I will restore to you the years that the locust hath eaten, and the cankerworm, and the caterpillar, and the palmerworm, my great army which I sent among you.

He shall send Jesus Christ, which before was

preached unto you, whom heaven must receive until the time of restitution of all things.

Saint Augustine said, "If we do not restore that which we have injuriously detained from another, our repentance is not real, but feigned and hypocritical." There are two ways of approaching Christianity, one is from the doctrinal side of believing and then doing. The other is from the side of doing and then believing. Jesus said, "He that will do the will of God shall know the doctrine." Doing the will of God is an attitude of the will which is being led in the way of God.

A complete study of the Scripture reveals several important facts about restitution. The first is the time to restore or the message of the gospel of salvation. The second is the time restored to the repentant individual or a message of mercy. The third consists of the times of restitution or the revelation of the wrath of God. An understanding of these three is necessary to prevent a loss of balance in the Christian life.

1. The Time to Restore

The time to restore is the present while salvation is being offered to sinful men. An event happened on the last trip of Jesus to Jerusalem which clearly illustrates this. Having just healed the blind man at Jericho the news that the miracle worker had come to town spread abroad through the streets and a crowd gathered from every quarter. For one on the outskirts of that crowd it was impossible to even catch a glimpse of Jesus. The thronging multitudes were wildly enthused and anxious to see the deeds of this outstanding individual. There was a man little in body and in soul who had a more than curious desire to see. His life had been hollow and empty. There was no friendship and love to fill the chambers of his soul with laughter and communion. Nothing was his but the echo of a misspent life and the wealth that it had brought. Yes, he, too, wanted to see Jesus for he had a need that was even greater than the blind man's. Repulsed again and again by the crowds that despised him, there was but one way left open to him. He discerned the line of march of the multitudes and went ahead of them. Down the main avenue of Jericho, shaded by gigantic sycamore trees, passed the procession. A low hanging limb offered a point of perspectus to the little man. He scampered up amid the downy, heart-shaped leaves and sat breathlessly waiting for the Great Helper to come. Soon the mob passed immediately under his vantage point. The advance members shouted jeers and threw sticks at him as they went by, crying, "Behold Zacchaeus, the tax gatherer in the tree." Fear haunted his eyes and yet with a dogged determination he held to his post.

Now that great Galilean was almost beneath him; should he speak in the face of that crowd, or should he hold his peace? There was no need to answer that question for Jesus, discerning the intensity of his desire and the frenzied hatred of the crowd for him, said, "Zacchaeus, make haste and come down, for today I must abide at thy house." In an instant he dropped to the ground with his pulse beating wildly and filled with joy that he, a socially ostracized Jew, should have the opportunity of entertaining the great Teacher and Saviour of the Jews. Continuing down the street toward his lovely mansion set back amid the verdant growth of the city of palms, the crowd murmured against Jesus for going to be with a sinner.

Realizing the incompatibility of the presence of Christ with his sinful life, Zacchaeus was overwhelmed by this manifestation of Christ's love.

While he was walking down the street the transformation took place in his heart. Surely he must give this individual complete and absolute sway over his life. Yes, he wanted Him to be his Lord and his Saviour, but in order to honestly make that decision he had to change his method of life and make restitution for the wrongs he had perpetrated. But what was that to his new found joy and to the knowledge that some one was interested in him for himself. Suddenly he stopped and halted Christ and the multitude. "Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor, and if I have taken anything from any man by false accusation I restore him fourfold." What a confession and what a restitution! Hear the answer that came from Jesus, "This day is salvation come to this house, for as much as he also is a son of Abraham." By his confession and his restitution Zacchaeus declared himself to be a true spiritual son of Abraham because he did the works of Abraham—works of faith and obedience.

2. The Time Restored

Wherein it is impossible to make up for the past we must fling ourselves upon the mercy of God and trust to His sovereign power to restore the years that are lost from the lives that have been injured. That we have a right to expect this as Christians is evident from the great prophecy and promise of the Book of Joel. The story is this. About 800 B.C. at the time of Isaiah the prophet, and when Israel had fallen into grievous sin, God sent a terrible scourge upon the people to call them back to Him. It was a scourge of locusts that descended from the north upon the land of Palestine and Judah and consumed all vegetation so that even the sacrifice in the temple was cut off because of lack of food and animals. They descended like a mighty army with martial tread and regular ranks. They darkened the heavens and covered the land. Under the chastening of the scourge the people repented and returned unto God. Then the Lord sent the winds which drove them to the desert, to the Dead Sea, and to the Mediterranean where the locusts were consumed. Then came the early and the latter rain refreshing the parched soil and bringing forth a new crop. At the repentance of the people God through a bounteous nature restored unto them the years that the locust had eaten, and the people worshipped Him as God.

Now this event was made the subject of prophecy by the prophet Joel, the prophecy of the day of Jehovah for the nation of Israel and of the day of chastisement for each unbelieving individual. For the nation Joel describes that great and terrible day of the Lord which shall some day come when Israel is regathered in their own country, still as an unbelieving people.

What God did for the ancient Israelites in restoring their crops and prosperity and what He will do for the future Israelites in restoring them nationally and giving them a spiritual blessing through the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon all flesh, that also He will do for the individual who has been in sin and rebellion and now repents. This is the gradual fulfillment of a prophecy throughout the years until an ultimate consummation. During this time if we have rebelled against God and have practiced sin both against Him and

our fellowmen, we have lost years of blessing out of our lives and may have caused others to have lost the same. Now the promise of God is in His great message of mercy that if any of us will repent He will restore the wasted years.

3. The Times of Restitution

Sad to say, not every individual is willing to make restitution and for such a man the Bible has yet another message about restitution which deals not with the present or the past but with the future. It is a message of the wrath of God.

At his Pentecostal sermon Peter proclaimed that the gift of the Holy Ghost was the fulfillment of the prophecy of Joel to the individual repenting man who would be saved by believing and receiving the Holy Ghost. In Acts 3, he proclaimed that great end-time blessing unto the Jewish nation which if they would receive would make them the dispensers of the gospel blessings to the world. This message of Peter is corroborated by that of Paul when he says that blindness in part has happened to Israel until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in, and so shall all Israel be saved; as it is written, there shall come out of Zion a Deliverer and He shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob. At present, according to both Peter and Paul the Jewish nation is in a period of scourge because of a refusal to repent. But some day they will repent and when they do as a nation the opportunity for individual Gentile repentance is past. We know not when the last one in the number of the elect shall be converted. But when that individual is converted the last chance will be gone to accept a gospel of mercy and the times of ultimate restitution shall take place. That means that he who is filthy shall be filthy still, and he who is just shall be just still, that all creation shall have been redeemed and those who have believed in Christ shall be restored unto the glory of the soul before the fall. But those who have refused to accept the message of salvation and to make restitution shall hear the message of wrath which says, "Depart from me all ye workers of iniquity into everlasting fire."

Conclusion

"Let us therefore walk circumspectly, not as fools but as wise, redeeming the time because the days are evil." It is now time to accept the great offer of salvation presented to us by the Son of Man who came to seek and to save the lost. It is time to make restitution for the past, for the years in which we have done evil, and to let God restore unto us the physical and spiritual blessings of life. And it is time to look to the glorious future, the times of the restitution of all things. Lift up your heads then for your redemption draweth nigh. Behold, He cometh with clouds, every eye shall behold Him, even they which pierced Him. Woe to the man who comes to that day with sin upon his hands.

Questions

1. To what extent will God restore the years that we have wasted? Read Joel Chapters I, II. Trace the three-fold fulfillment of this prophecy.

2. How necessary is making restitution of wrongs for one's spiritual happiness? How far back for this should we go in our lives? What can make up for wrongs we can never right?

3. In the Restitution of all things what is to happen? Is Jesus coming again? When? What will happen?

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Library Table

CONDUCTED BY PROFESSOR LEANDER S. KEYSER, M.A., D.D.

Right and Wrong Views of Heaven

RECENTLY we have been re-reading that able, helpful and yet trying book, William Adam Brown's *Beliefs that Matter*. It contains many things which we can gladly "sign on the dotted line," and also many things which we cannot endorse. Time would fail us to go through it and point out the statements of which we can approve and those which we are compelled to disapprove. In this article we shall deal only with what Dr. Brown has to say about the future life.

He does not accept the Biblical statements in regard to places. He holds that they do not agree with our present knowledge of astronomy. Such a place as sheol, with its Paradise and Gehenna, cannot be accepted nowadays, in consideration of our present advanced scientific knowledge. The Biblical representations, he says, cannot be accepted literally, because they are based on the geocentric view of the universe. The literal ascension of Christ to the right hand of God somewhere in the universe cannot be conceived of by the modern mind. So the one fact that remains is that the New Testament tells us of an immortal life beyond physical death, and that is the only belief in this case that matters.

It is apropos to say that, if the Biblical writers were in error on so many points of detail, that fact would cast doubt on their whole doctrine of immortality. If the Bible is the record of "God's self-revelation" to men, as Dr. Brown says elsewhere in his book, we are wondering why He should have permitted such a revelation to be mixed up with so many scientific errors, especially as the Bible depicts Him as "the God of the whole earth."

However, the major question in this context is, Are the Biblical representations of locality incorrect? Let us think it over. This universe is God's universe. It is a realm of time and space. It is a vast universe. Therefore, time and place must have occupied a great deal of God's attention when

He created the physical cosmos; and since He upholds and preserves it, He still must be interested in things that occupy space and exist in time. That being so, there must be places somewhere in the universe corresponding to Paradise and Gehenna, the two departments of Sheol (Greek, Hades), "the place of departed spirits." The former is generally represented in the Holy Scriptures as "above" or "up," while the latter is represented as "down" or "under the earth."

We do not think that these Biblical terms need to cause any difficulty for those of us who believe that the earth is round and that it is not the center of the universe. Away from the earth may be either up or down, according to the position occupied by the observer on the earth's surface. Gehenna need not be thought of as under the ground somewhere or in the center of the earth, but as some place beneath the whole round earth where the impenitent and unbelieving are consigned. Up may be toward the center of the universe, which is perhaps some great central orb where God reigns supreme and from which He rules the heavens and the earth which He originally created. Come to think of it in an astronomical sense, it does seem that there must be such a central orb which holds the whole physical universe in orderly movement by the force of gravitation—or if there is no such a force, then by the power of the omnipotent God. That place may be what the Bible calls heaven—the place where Christ reigns supreme and where the souls of His believing people dwell with Him. The Psalmist was led by the Holy Spirit to describe it in this exalted language: "In thy presence there is fullness of joy, and at thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore" (Ps.16:11).

Some Modernists represent the future existence of God's people as only a *state*, and not a *place*. This idea they hold especially regarding the state of the disembodied soul. But it is hard to think of the soul as being nowhere and yet conscious and happy. Of

course, here we are dealing with psychical matters, but surely, as far as we know anything about the human mind, it is bound up with the realities of time and space. Therefore the soul, if it is immortal, must be somewhere. That somewhere is the place we call heaven. That somewhere may be the great central orb of the cosmos. If it is not, will some one explain what he means by saying that the disembodied soul is nowhere, and yet is in a blissful state of conscious existence? It seems to us that every entity must have "a habitation and a name."

But what about the geocentric view of the universe—the old Ptolemaic astronomy? We do not believe that the Bible teaches it. There may be figurative expressions here and there that seem to imply it, just as today we speak of the sun's rising and setting, when we know it does nothing of the kind. But when we look more deeply into the Holy Scriptures, we find that, while they do not pretend to teach any special astronomical view, yet they give some intimations of the view of a vast central orb from which the rest of the universe is controlled. These passages have been set forth many times; yet the Modernists and skeptics continue to make the charge that the Bible teaches the Ptolemaic conception of the universe. The real Biblical teaching has been vividly and convincingly expounded in Lucas A. Reed's *Astronomy and the Bible*, to which we have referred more than once in this department. Write to the Pacific Press Publishing Association, Mountain View, California, for this volume. Another enlightening book is Dr. Horace C. Stanton's *The Starry Universe the Christian's Future Empire*, published by Fleming H. Revell Co., 158 Fifth Ave., New York.

Mr. Reed in the above-named book refers to Isa.40:22, which says: "It is He that sitteth upon the circle of the earth." He says that a literal translation of the Latin Vulgate is, "It is He that sitteth upon the *globe* of the earth." He also quotes Gesenius as translating the passage thus: "It is He that sitteth upon the *sphere* of the earth." Moreover, for the preposition "upon" the American Revised Version gives "above." Here, surely, is no teaching that the earth is flat, but a clear indication that it is round.

The patriarch Job, after contemplating the whole visible creation, adds: "Lo, these are but the outskirts of His ways; and how small a whisper do we hear of Him! But the thunder of His power, who can understand?" (Job 26:14; Moulton's translation

in *The Modern Reader's Bible*.) So Job could not have thought that the earth was the center of the universe, but regarded it as only a part of its "outskirts"—a part of its *suburbs*, so to speak. With this agree all the Biblical passages which represent heaven, and not the earth, as the final dwelling place of the children of God. Paul says: "Our citizenship is in heaven," Jesus said: "In my Father's abode are many homes; if it were not so I would have told you;" "This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." The Apostle John saw the Holy City, the New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven. The souls of the martyrs were before the throne in heaven; they were not here on earth. So the center of the physical cosmos cannot be this mundane planet, important as it is for God's great redemptive purpose.

Dr. Brown, we are glad to say, sets forth convincing arguments for the reality of the future life. One of the principal ones is that the saints are promised eternal fellowship with Jesus Christ, who was the greatest and noblest of persons and who Himself taught the doctrine of a future state of existence. Another major argument is that this little span of our earthly life does not fulfill the aspirations of the noblest people of the earth. It seems so unreasonable to believe that such people should perish forever, and all their striving go for naught.

However, some of Dr. Brown's ideas of the conditions of the future life of God's children are certainly not Scriptural, and we question their probability on the ground of reason. We will quote (p. 291):

The fact of progress after death is being more and more recognized in Protestant circles. (We do not know that it was ever positively denied in Protestant circles.) But if we do this, other changes must follow; for progress, as we know it here, is unmeaning unless there are obstacles to be overcome and testing to be undergone. So we are led to surmise that in the life to come, as well as here, there may still be room for the discipline of pain. If God, the ever blessed, is not immune from suffering; if (as the doctrine of the atonement teaches) He shares our burdens and bears the penalty of our sins; above all, if in the cross of Jesus He has set us an example which He expects us to follow, why should we think that the mere fact of death should bring us exemption? Surely, in God's heaven, if it is to be heaven at all, there must be lessons to be learned, burdens to be borne, sacrifices to be made, victories to be won.

Is that the Biblical conception of heaven? We fear it is the rationalist's idea, not that of the Biblicalist. If there are pains, burdens and sacrifices in heaven, that must connote

that there is sin there. Where can such a thought be found in God's Word? On the contrary, the Book plainly says: "And there shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie; but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life." Again: "And there shall be no more curse." If no more curse, then no more sin. The inhabitants of heaven are those who "have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." "There shall be no night there."

Dr. Brown thinks that in the future life we shall still need "the discipline of pain." But the Bible teaches a different doctrine: "And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away" (Rev.21:4); "They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more; . . . and God shall wipe all tears from their eyes" (Rev.7:17).

The idea that heaven is a place of rest does not meet with Dr. Brown's predilections. He says (p. 285): "Nor was the heaven to which they (some former Christians) looked forward such as to make a virile spirit mourn its loss. Granting that the harp and the crown are only symbolical, there was, in the promise of an endless existence of ease and rest, little to attract an active and energetic nature." Again he writes (pp. 285, 286): "The thought of heaven as a place of eternal peace, with nothing to suffer and nothing to do . . .—what is there in all this to appeal to a robust nature? Unless there is something new to be experienced or worthy to be achieved, why not be content to end life with a sleep from which there is no waking?"

You can read between the lines the writer's attempt to caricature the Biblical representations. However, the Bible presents a different picture of the celestial life and conditions. For example: "There remaineth therefore a Sabbath rest for the people of God" (Heb.4:9); "And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; and their works do follow them" (Rev.14:13).

When Jesus said to His disciples, "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's

abode are many homes: if it were not so, I would have told you; for I go to prepare a place for you" (John 14:1, 2), it is not likely that He was representing to them a place where they would still have trouble and sorrow and toil. We believe, too, that to many of the weary toilers of earth the prospect of a future life in which weariness and labor and worry are unknown has many attractions. We once heard a hard-working mother say, "I am tired all the time." Poor woman! the best thing we could say to her was, "There remaineth a rest for the people of God."

However, it must not be thought that rest here means inactivity. No; it means surcease from onerous toil. John in his Apocalypse represents the saints, the four living creatures and the twenty-four elders as engaged in ceaseless activity, especially in ascriptions of praise to their God and Redeemer. "Therefore they are before the throne of God, and serve Him day and night in His temple" (Rev.7:15); "And there shall be no more curse: but the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it: and His servants shall serve Him" (Rev.22:3). Read also about the activity of the "great multitude whom no man could number" praising God and the Lamb (Rev. 7:9). At intervals they shall "sing a new song;" they shall also "sing the song of Moses and the Lamb." Do the Modernists who are girding at the Biblical representations of heaven think that the worship of God will sometime become irksome? Surely fellowship with the Triune God, who is infinite and who has infinite diversity in His being and attributes, will afford infinite variety of blessedness and joy.

Nor is there any need of identifying toil, sorrow and sacrifice with "progress," as Dr. Brown does. We hope that, when we get to heaven, we shall be purified from defilement of every kind, but that does not mean that there shall not be progress. With God's vast physical universe and His infinite spiritual universe as ours ("for all things are yours:" we are "heirs of God and joint-heirs with Jesus Christ"), who knows but that throughout eternity we shall pass from one degree of knowledge and blessedness to another in fellowship with God and all His saints? We think a heaven of that kind is marvelously engaging and alluring. Even in this earthly existence times of peace are more conducive to real progress than are times of war.

We must confess that the idea of an immortality of pain, toil, taxing discipline and continual conflict with evil would be a terrific one to contemplate, and would daunt the bravest heart. It is reasonable to believe that, without such distressing experiences, the God who created this vast universe, with

all its diversity, and gave us the Bible to meet all our diversified needs in this life, will be able to provide enough variety of joys in the future life to prevent our immortal existence from becoming monotonous. "At thy right hand there are pleasures forever more."

Reviews of Recent Books

Ministry and Memoir of the Late Charles Hickman. Revised and edited by G. F. Vallance, 2 Broomhill Road, Goodmayes, Essex, England. 2s. 6d.

Perhaps very few of us Americans have known anything about Charles Hickman, and therefore this book will bring to us real information. Mr. Hickman was a devoted minister and servant of the Lord. He gave up a remunerative business that he might preach the gospel and win souls to Christ. His work was mostly done in England and Ireland. He often spoke in public parks to large audiences, answering the objections of skeptics. In this book a brief biography is furnished by Mr. G. G. Vallance, and the rest of the book is made up of sermons and addresses by Mr. Hickman, printed from manuscripts he had prepared before his death. They are of a high order of merit, thoroughly Biblical, filled with evangelical force and fervor, and show evidence of originality in both style and thought. Mr. Hickman knew what was the heart of the gospel, and therefore his sermons are well adapted to convert sinners and edify saints.

Difficulties of the Evolution Theory. By Douglas Dewar. Edward Arnold & Company, 41 and 43 Maddox Street, London, W. I., England; also Longmans, Green & Company, 55 Fifth Ave., New York. 12s. 6d; \$5.00.

Our attention was called to this book by Professor George McCready Price, who recommended it as a work of real scientific merit. At our request an editorial copy of the book was sent to us by the publishers. We have read it with intense interest. In fact, it is fascinating to the person who is interested in the problem of evolution and its bearing on science and religion. In one respect it is a model of polemics: there is not an epithet in the book. Everywhere the author preserves his poise and never descends to scorn or abuse. He simply uses reason and appeals to scientific facts. The work is quite scientific, in some places technically so. The author's purpose is to con-

vince the scientists themselves and their followers that the evolutionary theory has insuperable difficulties and that it is far from being factually verified. In dealing with the changes in organisms effected by artificial breeding, he shows that no new families have ever been brought into existence by such efforts; that the new forms all "are fertile when bred *inter se*"; that all breeds of pigeons are pigeons, all breeds of horses are horses, and all breeds of dogs are dogs." He also proves that all such breeding is suddenly brought to a standstill and can be carried no further. His treatment of the argument from geographical distribution is most effective, showing that it works into the hands of the creationist rather than into those of the evolutionist. He deals convincingly with nascent and vestigial organs, with blood reactions, with the development of the animal and human embryo (a lengthy chapter), transformations assumed by the evolutionists, characteristics of animals incompatible with evolution, and so on. However, his chapter on the testimony of the fossils is the most crushing one in the book. Again and again he shows that phyla, classes, families and genera appear suddenly and in fully developed form. The following formula recurs again and again in Mr. Dewar's closely reasoned presentation: "No fossils have been found intermediate between any of these and earlier forms." For example: "In the earliest layer of the Eocene (Palæocene) appear suddenly four new orders of placental mammals . . . all of which became extinct long ago. No fossils are known intermediate between any of them and any earlier form. A great array of new mammals appear suddenly in the Eocene." And then he gives the long scientific names of them, some of them being extinct and others surviving today. Then he adds:

. . . they were represented by animals ranging between the rabbit and the rhinoceros in size. It is significant that this great array of placental mammals appears practically simultaneously, as time is

reckoned geologically. Moreover, it is not possible to point to any fossil as an ancestor of any of the above groups.

Surely, surely, if evolution is true, many intermediate and intergrading species and types ought to be found by the geologists. Our author says: "In order to prove their theory, evolutionists have to find, not a few missing links, but scores of whole lengths of *chains*." We have been quoting from pages 129-132. The appendices to the volume are rarely valuable. One of them shows how impossible it would have been for birds to evolve from reptiles. Another deals with the supposed links between man and animals. The author does not appeal to the Bible or religion; he places his whole presentation on a purely scientific basis. Most sincerely do we hope that this book will secure a wide reading here in America. Do not mind the somewhat steep price, but get the book, even if you have to stint yourself in your eating.

Christ Down East. By R. G. Burnett. Fleming H. Revell Company, 158 Fifth Ave., New York, Chicago, London and Edinburgh. \$1.25.

If your lachrymal glands are not pretty solidly formed, they will let loose the tears and dim your vision more than once as you read some of the pathetic incidents recited in this book. Some months ago we reviewed a book entitled *God in the Slums*, published by the Revell Company. The present book may be called a companion volume to that book. It is described as the slums of the East End of London "looked at from another angle." The book is really an account of the power of God's grace in saving people from all kinds of sins and their accompanying environments. The story of that brave and devoted man, Peter Thompson, the founder of what is known as the East End Mission, is touchingly told. No less heroic and consecrated is his successor, Mr. F. W. Chudleigh, who is now carrying on the work. The book gives a vivid picture of conditions in the London slum district before this evangelistic and charitable work was undertaken and the wonderful changes that have been wrought. Of course, those areas have not been converted into a paradise, but they certainly have been wonderfully transformed. The following sentence is so descriptive that we believe we can commend the book to our readers most forcibly by quoting it: "Humor and pathos and heroic endeavor are interwoven in the many stories of men and women who have triumphed over diffi-

culties and planted a little heaven in a hell of squalor and misery." A book like this one surely does magnify the grace of God in Christ Jesus. It certainly ought to melt the stoniest heart with sympathy for the poor and oppressed, and ought to move well-to-do people everywhere to do what they can for the uplift and salvation of submerged humanity. The book should have a wide reading here in America where we also have slums in most of our large cities. What a field for practicing the Good Samaritan principle of the Christian religion!

Barbed Arrows. By Roy L. Smith, D.D., Litt.D. Richard R. Smith, Inc., 12 East 41st Street, New York. \$1.50.

Here is a book that is rightly named. A "barbed" arrow is one with reversed hooks, so that, when it is thrust into an object, it cannot be withdrawn. Many of the thoughts in this book are just like that: when they penetrate the mind, they stick. The book is made up of brief, crisp sermons, each based upon a short text of Scripture. The author has adopted the terse style. There is not a long and complicated sentence, in the sense of being hard to parse and analyze grammatically, on these brilliant pages. Yet the thoughts follow one another in logical sequence. The author has a decided vein of originality and does not imitate. He says things in his own way.

Yet, engaging as the book is, it has its faults. Now and then the author makes a gratuitous side-thrust at theology and creeds. Why do so many men today think they must cry up one good thing by crying down another good thing? It is not theology *per se* that is doing harm today; it is the wrong kind of theology. As for creeds, everybody has a creed of some kind. Dr. Smith himself has. Even the atheist has a creed; so does the Modernist. Dr. Smith's title of his forty-fifth chapter, "*Christianity Versus Christ*," is a misnomer, for Christianity, properly defined, is that system of truth and salvation which is derived from Christ and the Holy Scriptures; therefore Christianity and Christ cannot be set over against each other. It is the faults and sins of so-called Christians that Dr. Smith means to score. When Dr. Smith says, "The old theology declared that God drove Adam and Eve out of the Garden of Eden because of their sin and compelled them to work as a punishment," and then adds, "The Almighty never suffered from a worse libel," he is really

criticizing, not "the old theology," but the Bible itself. However, it was not work in itself that was imposed on mankind as a punishment, but hard and wearisome and onerous toil; for even before sin came into the world, our first parents were bidden to "dress and keep" the garden (Gen.2:15). As to Dr. Smith's Christology, we are somewhat uncertain. Whether Christ is the eternal Son of God, the second person of the Holy Trinity, and the expiating Redeemer of the world, is not explicitly stated, although it may be implied. This much is certain: Christ is regarded as the final and authoritative teacher and leader of social and ethical Christianity and His teaching and example ought to prevail in the world. In spite of some serious defects, the book is certainly gripping and helpfully suggestive.

The Deluge Story in Stone. By Byron C. Nelson, Th.M. Augsburg Publishing House, 425-429 South 4th Street, Minneapolis, Minn. \$1.50.

Attention has frequently been called in these columns to Dr. Nelson's valuable book, *After its Kind*, which has run into the third revised edition. The author has now come out with a new book which promises to be no less popular and just as useful and timely. The first book deals with the facts of biology, the phyla, classes, genera and species of the vegetable and animal kingdoms, and proves that the only way to explain them adequately is on the basis of special creations. Throughout the whole work Dr. Nelson exposed the inadequacy of the theory of evolution to account for the outstanding facts. The present volume presents a vast array of data from geology and paleontology to verify the Biblical narrative of the Noachian Deluge. The author everywhere makes his appeal to the facts to be observed in the realm of nature. The work evidences both historical and scientific erudition. To those who have not made historical investigation along this line, the opening chapters of the book will be a surprising revelation. Dr. Nelson goes back in history as far as Philo the Jew, born about 15 B.C., to cite writers who attribute geological data to the great Biblical Deluge; then he traces the history down to the present time, and shows that up to the time of Darwin and Wallace many scientists, if not the most of them, advocated the Deluge geology. These historical researches constitute a very valuable part of the book. We wish that we could go into the details of Dr. Nelson's argumentation, but we cannot take the time just

now. Perhaps in the next number of this journal a fuller analysis of the work will be given by a competent person. Just now we are prepared to say in all sincerity that we think our author presents a body of facts that establish his position. It seems to us that geology furnishes clear and convincing evidence of catastrophism, and that principally by means of great aqueous inundations, currents and floods, as the chief cause of the fossils and strata found in the bosom and on the surface of the earth. There is no historic event in the distant past that so effectively accounts for the main facts of geology as does the Biblical Deluge. We hope our readers will get the book and see for themselves how cogent the argumentation is; how solidly it is based on scientific data. The book is abundantly illustrated with pictures which help to make vivid to the eye the marvelous geological story of the earth.

Additional Literary Notes

In our next installment of "Reviews of Recent Books," we will include a commendatory review by our friend, Professor Kenneth Mackenzie, of McVeigh Harrison's recent book, *Common Sense About Religion*. We have examined the work, and agree that it is a notable one, packed with information and running over with erudition. For the most part, too, the author takes the evangelical position, and we feel convinced that in all of his work he means to do so.

However, we think that his acceptance of a certain kind of evolution is a real serious fault of the work. It is evident that he believes that man's body is the result of that process; for he speaks of the difference between *Homo sapiens* and "the animals from which he derived his body" (p. 84); and he identifies *Homo sapiens* with the Adam of the Bible (pp. 80-89). But this is opposed to the clear teaching of the Bible, which says that God fashioned (*yatsar*) man's body from "the dust of the ground" (Gen. 2:7). The verb *yatsar* does not mean to grow, or develop, or evolve; it means to *fashion* or to *mold*. There is not the slightest intimation anywhere in the Bible that man in any of his parts came up from an animal stock.

The author also commits himself to what is known as "emergent evolution," which he then identifies with creation. To put the two together in this way is a kind of hybrid combination. In some of the processes of nature,

as we know, something new in form emerges. Some naturalists have gotten hold of this fact, and now are trying to make it account for everything; that is, instead of regarding evolution as a slow and gradual process, they believe in evolution by leaps and bounds. Mr. Harrison tries to show that these leaps (saltations) are acts of divine creation. Thus he believes in divine creation, and for that we commend him.

But what would be the exact method of Mr. Harrison's creative emergent evolution? It would be this: at some time in the remote past God, by adding something new to him, caused an animal to spring up into a man—*Homo sapiens*. That man was the first individual of the Cro-magnon race, and that individual was Adam.

We believe this doctrine to be absurd, and opposed to the plain teaching of the Bible. To read emergent evolution, even if God did it, into the simple and lucid language of Gen. 1:26,27 is eisegesis, not exegesis. It is hardly thinkable, either, that God would have taken some animal from the jungle and changed him into a human and immortal personality; and then have caused an inspired writer to say that He had created the man in His own image. To our mind, the plain statements of the Bible, taken at their face value and in their literal sense, afford a much more reasonable and scientific account of the origin of the human race. The arguments for this view have been presented so often in this journal that they need not be repeated here.

As a rule, it is unbelievers who claim that they have reason on their side. But our friend, Rev. Andrew M. Olsen, turns the tables upon them by issuing a booklet with the title, *An Appeal to Reason*. It seems to us to be clear, from his method of treatment, that fundamental reasoning is on the side of Christianity and the inspiration of the Bible. Our author first shows that the natural creation itself affords *prima facie* evidence of the existence and handiwork of God, and that materialism signally fails to explain any of the outstanding phenomena of the realm of nature. Then he shows that many of the statements of the Bible are in accordance with the latest validated facts of science. The history of nations, and especially of the Jewish people, proves the Biblical teaching to be true. Messianic prophecy in the Old Testament is exactly fulfilled in Christ. Cogent reasons are given for the

atonement as the only remedy for sin. Address the author, Rev. Andrew M. Olsen, Mitchell, Nebraska; price, 30 cents.

A spiritually helpful booklet on *The Pearl of Psalms* (meaning the twenty-third Psalm), by George Henderson, is published by G. F. Vallance, 2 Broomhill Road, Goodmayes, Essex, England. Price, 9d. After a general introduction to the whole Psalm, the author takes it up verse by verse and interprets its true spiritual meaning and applies it to the needs of the Christian Life.

How strangely and vaguely the spiritually unenlightened mind reasons on the subject of religion! Mr. Julian Huxley still wants to be considered religious, even though he does not believe in a personal God, or at least doubts His existence. In a recent book reviewed above (*Christ Down East*) we find the following excerpt from one of Mr. Huxley's recent writings on the subject:

In this view the realities of religious experience remain real, remain valid; but they need not be interpreted in theistic terms. The sense of dependence on power greater than self; the feeling of mystic union with the driving forces of reality; conversion; grace; the sense of sin and of forgiveness of sin; atonement, direct and vicarious; prayer, not in the sense of petition, but of meditation guided by aspiration; worship, not in the sense of propitiating a divine Being, but of celebrating the mystery of existence in the beauty of holiness—all these are spiritual realities which cannot be denied, and are demonstrably of the greatest importance in the spiritual progress of concrete beings. But they continue to exist whether we choose to explain them in terms of a personal God or not.

Well, read these statements over again, and you will realize what a vague kind of religious experience such abstractions would give. Can "concrete human beings" hold real communion with mere impersonal forces? How can men experience the forgiveness of sin if there is no personal God to speak to the soul the word of pardon? All said and done, how much better, how much more real, how much more satisfying, is the Christian doctrine, which teaches that we human persons may have real fellowship with a God who is personal! Much better is the statement of Dr. R. J. Campbell, who, we are told, has given up what was once called his "new theology," and is now preaching the real gospel. He says:

If religion means anything at all, it surely means that we are in communion with One who knows and feels and cares for us one by one.

It certainly would be useless to tell a person who is under conviction of sin to seek

"mystic union with the driving forces of reality."

Note the difference between the Christian and the purely scientific viewpoint. We quote again from the book above referred to, *Christ Down East* (p. 27):

When Sir James Jeans reminds us that the number of the stars is as the grains of sand on all the shores of the seas, and that man is but the accidental inhabitant of the smallest of the planets, we shudder at the thought of our infinitesimal littleness. But that is not the whole story. God is not so awful, so relentless, so impersonal, so infinitely remote as His universe. He stoops to touch the sick child in the dreary tenement and to comfort the mourner in the grim alley; for He sent His Son into the world to prove His compassion and His forgiving love for the children of misfortune.

A review of ordinary length, such as is given above, does not do justice to the importance of Douglas Dewar's new book, *Difficulties of the Evolution Theory*. For this reason we desire to add a few relevant excerpts from that notable work. In his fourth appendix the author gives a searching and technical analysis of the supposed links between men and animals. He deals with the Java man, the Pekin man, the Heidelberg man, the Piltdown man, the Neanderthal race, and the Cro-Magnon race. In all these cases he gives the scientific nomenclature. Let us hear what he has to say about the Java man (*Pithecanthropus Erectus*), discovered by Professor Dubois:

The deposit in which it was found is deemed by Dubois to be the Upper Pliocene epoch; most authorities, however, regard it as very early Pleistocene. The fossil consists of a skull-cap, a thigh bone, two molar teeth, one pre-molar, and a fragment of a front part of a jaw. One molar was discovered in September, 1891; the skull-cap in October, 1891, one meter from the tooth; the thigh bone in August, 1892, fifteen meters from the skull-cap; a little later a second molar was found three meters from the skull; afterward a pre-molar; and finally, at a distance of some miles, the fragment of a jaw. The same layer contained the remains of other animals, none of which are primates.

Despite a most careful and prolonged search, no further traces of *Pithecanthropus* have been found. In the circumstances it is by no means certain that all the above fragments belong to one and the same species. . . . The molars, which represent the right and left wisdom teeth, are not equally worn, which may indicate that they do not belong to the same individual. They are considerably larger than the corresponding teeth of an orang or any known human race. They resemble the teeth of the orang rather than those of man. The femur is about 18 inches in length, and has a very human appearance; it is straight, indicating that its possessor walked upright.

By these particulars Mr. Dewar means to show that, while the teeth are much like

those of the orang, the femur is human. That would mean a very uneven kind of evolution. A human femur and an orang tooth! Why should the femur become human before the molars do? Our author says further:

Keith and Dubois believe that the femur and the skull-cap belong to the same species. If this be correct, it follows, on the evolutionary theory, that man acquired his upright gait before his brain became human. . . . If the teeth and the skull-cap belong to the same species, this must have been a very big primate, which, even if an ape, should have a brain larger than that of any living anthropoid. This, taken in conjunction with the poor development of the front part of the brain, seems to indicate that *Pithecanthropus* was merely a large anthropoid ape, which is the opinion of Boule and some other authorities.

After giving the other so-called "links" a searching examination, Mr. Dewar comes to *Homo sapiens*, the Cro-magnon man, of whom he says:

The Cro-magnon man seems to have been both physically and intellectually on a par with living man, and he differs so greatly from the Neanderthal man, whom he supplanted, that it does not seem possible for him to have evolved from the latter.

Again he says (p. 187):

If these (the three well-marked races of *Homo sapiens*), together with Neanderthal man, evolved from a common human ancestor, that ancestor must have lived long before the Lower Pleistocene, and it is most surprising that no fossils have been found throwing light on the supposed evolution of the above three races of *Homo sapiens*. Their fossils are abundant, but not one (fossil) is known linking any of them with a hypothetical human ancestor.

Owing to lack of fossil evidence of man's supposed evolution, zoologists are reduced to guessing at his origin. Various guesses have been made: that he evolved from some anthropoid ape; that the human line branched off from the primate stock almost simultaneously with the anthropoid ape line; that the human line branched off from some Old World monkey; that it branched off from a very early tarsioid stock.

To these "guesses" we might add that of our valued friend, Professor Austin H. Clark, who holds that man evolved along an independent line from the original amoeba, and therefore never had an animal lineage. These wide differences of opinion among evolutionists would seem to indicate that the actual data are not sufficient to establish the theory upon a scientific basis.

It is a dangerous thing for a young man to start out in life without the thought of God.—Gladstone.